POLITICAL EQUALITY: RELIGIOUS TOLERATION FROM ROGER WILLIAMS TO JEFFERSON

PERRY BELMONT

Class 277.32 S B417 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

BY PERRY BELMONT

NATIONAL ISOLATION AN ILLUSION

SURVIVAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE

RETURN TO SECRET CAMPAIGN FUNDS

POLITICAL EQUALITY; RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

POLITICAL EQUALITY: RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

FROM ROGER WILLIAMS TO JEFFERSON

BY

PERRY BELMONT

Author of "*National Isolation an Illusion*," "*The Survival of the Democratic Principle*," and "*Return to Secret Party Funds*"

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK—LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1927

277.32 S
B417
84340

Copyright, 1927
by
Perry Belmont

NEW YORK
LIBRARY
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Made in the United States of America

CONTENTS

PART		PAGE
I.	Dual Allegiance Impossible	3
II.	Political Aspects of Religious Wars	31
III.	Influences of Netherlands on America	67
IV.	Rhode Island	107
	Jefferson	133
	Conclusion	137
	Appendix	139

POLITICAL EQUALITY; RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

FROM ROGER WILLIAMS TO JEFFERSON

DUAL ALLEGIANCE IMPOSSIBLE

PART I

DUAL ALLEGIANCE IMPOSSIBLE

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.—Article VI, section 3, Constitution of the United States.

Oath taken by the Governor of New York, prescribed by the State Constitution:

ARTICLE XIII

Section 1. Oath of Office.

Members of the Legislature, and all officers, executive and judicial, except such inferior officers as shall be by law exempted shall, before they enter on the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of New York, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of ———— ————, according to the best of my ability;" and all such officers who shall have been chosen at

any election shall, before they enter on the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the oath or affirmation above prescribed, together with the following addition thereto, as part thereof:

"And I do further solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have not directly or indirectly paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed or offered or promised to contribute, any money or other valuable thing as a consideration or reward for the giving or withholding a vote at the election at which I was elected to said office, and I have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding any such vote;" and no other oath, declaration or test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust.

THIS volume is presented by a member of a great historic political party, in whose fundamental principles, as the years go by, he becomes with increasing conviction, a more firm believer.

Belonging to the American Protestant Episcopal Church, it is none the less clear to the writer than it must be to all other American Protestants, of whatever denomination, who may give themselves the trouble to reflect upon the subject, that the religious test exist-

ing for political and dynastic reasons under the Established Church, which applies to the chief magistracy or ruling monarchy in all other English-speaking nations, should have no lodgment among the American people.

Every citizen of the United States is entitled to political equality. Not only is political equality established as the Constitutional birth-right of every citizen, but thereby the government has reserved the right to avail itself of the services of those citizens, who, in the opinion of the voters in local and national elections, are the best qualified for office. There can be no true political equality that is not based upon religious liberty.

Toward the end of the Eighteenth century, Paley defined toleration as "the recognition of private judgment in matters of faith and worship. The effective recognition by the state of the right that every person has to enjoy the benefit of all the laws and of all the rights and of all the social privileges without regard to religion." And again: "Toleration is of two kinds: The allowing of dissenters the unmo-

lested profession and exercise of their religion, *but with an exclusion from offices of trust or emoluments in the state, which is a partial toleration;* and the admitting them without distinction to all the civil privileges and capacities of other citizens, *which is a complete toleration.*"

The Constitutional prohibition of a religious test, and the oath of office under the New York State Constitution, cited above, ending with, "and no other oath, declaration or test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust," are in complete accord.

A dual allegiance is not a possible contingency in the case of a man of religious conviction who has taken the oath of office as Governor of New York that he will support the Constitution of the United States. The question of a possible dual allegiance was definitely answered by Cardinal Gibbons in the *North American Review* of March, 1909:

"Suppose, it is said, the Pope were to issue commands in purely civil matters, should not Catholics be bound to yield him obedience?

The Pope will take no such act, we know, even though it is not a part of Catholic faith that he is infallible in the exercise of his authority; but were he to do so he would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending not only against civil society but against God and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic who clearly recognized this would not be bound to obey the Pope; or, rather, his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey, because with Catholics conscience is the supreme law which under no circumstances can we ever lawfully disobey."

This statement of a great figure in the life of the country vividly recalls the simple, plain and unmistakable—to the lettered and *unlettered*—words, proclaiming the doctrine which lies at the foundation of that religion in regard to which Cardinal Gibbons is still a universally honored authority. Every branch of the Protestant religion also, every true religion, is equally based upon the same principle declared in those words: "Render therefore unto

Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

Whenever a people is ruled by the merging of the civil and the religious authority civil and religious liberty are endangered or destroyed.

The separation of Church and State penetrates to the heart and root of the Democratic principle of government.

The antagonistic principle of government prevails whenever a theocracy is formed by the union of State and Church. The theory of the Divine Right to rule, whether under a colonial Massachusetts theocracy, a Catholic Bourbon or a Lutheran Hohenzollern, is in unending conflict with the Democratic principle.

Jefferson writing to John Adams, October 13, 1813, upon the subject of what is now known as the "Jefferson Bible,"[1] said:

". . . We must reduce our volume to the simple evangelists, select, even from them,

[1] Extracts from Letter of Jefferson to John Adams, October 13, 1813:

"I now send you, according to your request, a copy of the syllabus. To fill up this skeleton with arteries, with veins, with nerves, muscles and flesh, is really beyond my time and in-

the very words only of Jesus . . . There will be found remaining the most sublime code of morals ever offered to man . . . such as were professed and acted on by the unlettered Apostles and Christians of the first century."

The book referred to, *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth,* is the property of the United States National Museum at Washington. A description of it was written by A.

---

formation. Whoever could undertake it would find great aid in Enfield's judicious abridgement of Bruckner's History of Philosophy, in which he has reduced five or six quarto volumes, of one thousand pages each of Latin closely printed, to two moderate octavos of English open type.

"To compare the morals of the Old with those of the New Testament, would require an attentive study of the former, a search through all its books for its precepts, and through all its history for its practices, and the principles they prove. . . . In extracting the pure principles which he taught, we should have to strip off the artificial vestments in which they have been muffled by priests, who have travestied them into various forms, as instruments of riches and power to themselves. . . . We must reduce our volume to the simple evangelists, select, even from them, the very words only of Jesus, paring off the amphiboligisms into which they have been led, by forgetting often, or not understanding, what had fallen from him, by giving their own misconceptions as his dicta, and expressing unintelligibly for others what they had not understood themselves. There will be found remaining the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has

R. Spofford, formerly Librarian of Congress: "*The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth,* extracted textually from the Gospel in Greek, Latin, French and English; the title and very full index in his own hand. Texts were cut by him out of printed copies of Greek, Latin, French and English Testaments and pasted in this book of blank pages."

In a letter dated July 27, 1895, Miss Randolph of Shadwell, Virginia, states that "the

---

ever been offered to man. I have performed this operation for my own use, by cutting verse by verse out of the printed book, and arranging the matter which is evidently his. . . . The result is an octavo of forty-six pages, of pure and unsophisticated doctrines, such as were professed and acted on by the *unlettered* Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, and the Christians of the first century. Their Platonizing successors, indeed, in after times, in order to legitimate the corruptions which they had incorporated into the doctrines of Jesus, found it necessary to disavow the primitive Christians, who had taken their principles from the mouth of Jesus himself, of his Apostles, and the Fathers contemporary with them. They excommunicated their followers as heretics, branding them with the opprobrious name of Ebonites or Beggars. . . .

"Such a canvass is too broad for the age of seventy, and especially of one whose chief occupations have been in the practical business of life. We must leave, therefore, to others, younger and more learned than we are, to prepare this euthanasia for Platonic Christianity, and its restoration to the primitive simplicity of its founder. . . ."

idea he had at first was to compile a book which would be valuable for the use of the Indians." April 21st, 1803, Jefferson wrote to Dr. Benjamin Rush of his estimate of the doctrines of Jesus and indicated its confidential character in the following words: "and in confiding it to you, I know it will not be exposed to the malignant perversion of those who make every word from me a text for new misrepresentations and calumnies. I am, moreover, averse to the communication of my religious tenets to the public, because it would countenance the presumption of those who have endeavored to draw them before that tribunal, and to seduce public opinion to erect itself into that inquest over the rights of conscience, which the laws have so justly proscribed. It behooves every man who values liberty of conscience for himself to resist invasions of it in the case of others, or their case may, by change of circumstances, become his own."

Even under primitive tribal conditions, theocracies may exist, but the separation of Church and State widens as civilization ad-

vances. The Reformation commenced as the revival and restoration of civilization under the Renaissance was reaching its highest degree. Toleration followed the Reformation, political equality and separation of Church and State followed toleration.

MODERN DEMOCRACY, THE CHILD OF THE REFORMATION

"Modern democracy is the child of the Reformation, not of the Reformers." [1]

The more thoroughly we understand the Reformation, the deeper the conviction that its final outgrowth was religious toleration—now its essential principle and the source of its lasting power. This is made evident by the fact that it was in those countries where the Reformation first gained ascendancy that religious toleration followed.

On the 19th of September, 1926, there was celebrated in a small village on the river Ain, St. Martin du Fresne, the 400th anniversary

[1] G. P. Gooch, *The History of the English Democratic Ideas of the Seventeenth Century.* Cambridge, 1898, page 8.

of the birth of Sebastian Castellion. The actual date should have been 1915, but as that happened to be in the very throes of the great war the ceremony could not be held. His memory has been kept alive in France, where he was born; in Holland, at Amsterdam, the Geneva of the North, where he preached, and in Switzerland, where he died. At the celebration those who called themselves The Sons of the Reformation dedicated a monument they had erected on which was inscribed:

TO SEBASTIAN CASTELLION,
The Liberal Reformer.
The grateful homage of the believers
in freedom of conscience.
THE SONS OF THE REFORMATION.

These men are today in the broadest sense the Sons of the Reformation. They believe in freedom of conscience, as Castellion understood it. He was a man of deep faith, but none the less a powerful advocate of absolute toleration in matters of faith. It is of him

that Michelet, the historian, says, "That poor printer established for all time the great law of toleration."

This frail artisan of a monumental achievement succumbed at 48 years of age under its crushing burden and was buried in the historic cloister of Basle. How many of us, not specially grounded in church history, know of him or of others like him who may have preceded him?

We may stand in the center of an historical panorama, but can actually see, as we turn, only certain sections of it. In the endeavor to understand the history of the Reformation or any historical period our mental vision, while infinitely more extended and comprehensive than the physical, is subject to corresponding limitations.

THE MEASURE OF TIME IN HISTORY

Who is there who aspires to such omniscience as to believe that he can know and understand in their relation to each other throughout the world even the rapidly suc-

ceeding events of his own time? Or who can accurately estimate the course of time, or how shall we measure the years that separate us either from Roger Williams or Jefferson?

October 14, 1926, Mr. Robert P. Skinner, the American Consul General in Paris, now Minister to Greece, said: "It was my luck many years ago when I first came abroad to be thrown immediately into some civic celebration in which the Greek government participated. The purpose was to observe the celebration of the 1500th anniversary of the foundation of Marseilles. . . . Fifteen hundred years since the beginning of a Greek civilization in France, preceded by one knows not how many centuries of civilization in Greece. We in the United States this year are celebrating the 150th anniversary of our Independence, and we think 150 years is a long time. Compare these two periods—1500 years on this side and 150 years on our side."

If we return to the other side, we find the Kingdom of Belgium, as described in the *Life of Leopold II* (Count L. de Lichtervelde,

Brussels, 1926): "The Kingdom of Belgium shows plainly the marks of its youth. Each generation occupies but a moment in the course of time, and it is only through an illusion caused by amplifying it that we measure that brief course which is open to us in this world.

"The Belgium of 1865" (the accession of Leopold II, the second King of the Belgians) "was still at its beginnings, a state which had not yet had time to acquire a definite character." The present King is the third of the dynasty. Compared to the United States, Belgium is a younger nation. The third generation of the Belgian dynasty will in 1930 celebrate its centenary, while we have recently celebrated the 150th anniversary of our independence. The difference in time is negligible in the history of the world.

John A. Stewart, known to almost everyone in New York to the end of his life as an active man of business, was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Lincoln's administration and again held that same office under the Cleveland administration in 1894.

He was born in New York, August 21, 1822, and died in that city December 17, 1926. He was born four years before the death of Jefferson and Adams. He was Chairman of the Board of Directors of the United States Trust Co. of New York to the last day of his life, although during the last two years he seldom left his house. Without assuming extraordinary longevity on the part of his father or grandfather he was not much more than three generations from the time of Roger Williams.

Jefferson's eldest daughter, Martha, married Thomas Mann Randolph, later Governor of Virginia. They had many children; one of them, their daughter, Ellen, was married to Joseph Coolidge of Boston. Among his children were Randolph Coolidge, and Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Minister to Paris, appointed by President Cleveland.

If the time since Jefferson is measured by the life of the nation, extending through the colonial period to its origins in Insular and

Continental Europe, he is brought very close to us.

EARLY FOUNDERS OF THE REFORMATION

Those we generally look upon as early founders of the Reformation, appear, after the lapse of time, in a perspective enabling us to concentrate our attention upon the religious principles they expounded and of the fruitful ideas of which they were the vehicles. It would narrow and diminish our conception of that mighty movement if it should seem to us incarnated in Wyclif, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Castellion, or any other leader, great or small. The lives of the great preachers of religious liberty undoubtedly add to our knowledge of the Reformation, but its true principles dominate and override individual leaders. It would lessen our gratitude to them all should we judge them in the light of their personal relations to the movement itself, rather than by the great achievement in which they were co-laborers.

Their collaboration and the continuity of their efforts will best be understood when we recall that some have said, had there been no Erasmus there would have been no Luther. Certainly Erasmus paved the way for Luther. Revolutions generally commence at the top, with a moderation that renders them none the less effective. The popular mass movement which usually follows and cooperates in the overturning of an established order may, in its fury, lead to extreme violence and destruction.

In 1467, the year that Charles the Bold became the Duke of Burgundy and sixteen years before the birth of Martin Luther, an illegitimate child was born at Rotterdam, named Desiderius Erasmus. He became a Dominican monk, and early gained distinction throughout Europe for his liberalism and intellectual force. He was sent to the University of Paris by the Archbishop of Cambrai. Introduced at the court of Henry VII, he became the friend of Cardinal Wolsey, Sir Thomas More, of Warham, Archbishop of

Canterbury, of Dean Colet and other leading men in the intellectual life of England. Erasmus was released from his monastic vows by the Pope, Julius II, whose successor, Leo X, received him in Rome as the most brilliant personality in European literature. Though he was offered every inducement to remain in Rome, he returned to England on the accession of Henry VIII, but his sovereign, the Duke of Burgundy, the future Emperor, recalled him to The Netherlands and established him at the University of Louvain.

He represented more than any one the education and learning of the Renaissance. He translated and edited selections from the Apostolic Fathers. All that was known at the time of the gospels and epistles were the passages upon which theologians had constructed formulas. Erasmus published the text with notes, which destroyed the traditional interpretations and brought back to their simple and original form the teachings of Christ and the Apostles.

In one of his letters to a prince of the

Church he said: "Let us have done with theological refinements. . . . Necessity first brought articles upon us, and ever since we have refined and refined until Christianity has become a thing of words and creeds. Sincerity vanishes, contention grows hot and charity cold. Then came the civil power with stake and gallows, and men are forced to profess what they do not believe."

The great ecclesiastics of his time allowed him remarkable freedom to propose his plans for reformation. He wrote to the Pope: "If your Holiness give power to men who neither believe in Christ nor care for you, but think only of their own appetites, I fear there will be danger. We can trust your Holiness, but there are bad men who will use your virtues as a cloak for their own malice." Speaking of the monks, he said: "These people are the tyrants of Europe. The Pope himself is afraid of them."

Of Luther he wrote to Duke George of Saxony: "I look upon him as a necessary evil in the corruption of the church; a medicine,

bitter and drastic, from which sounder health would follow. Luther has taken up the cause of honesty and good sense against abominations which are no longer tolerable. His enemies are men under whose worthlessness the Christian world has groaned too long."

To the heads of the church he wrote: "Learning they pretend has given birth to Luther, though Luther has but little of it. Luther thinks more of the Gospel than of scholastic divinity, and that is his crime. This is plain at least, that the best men everywhere are those who are least offended with him."

To his friend, the Archbishop of Mayence, he wrote: "Luther's life they admit to be innocent and blameless. Such a tragedy I never saw. The most humane men are thirsting for his blood, and they would rather kill him than mend him. . . . In old times, even a heretic was listened to; if he recanted, he was absolved; if he persisted, he was at worst excommunicated. Now they will have nothing but blood."

In the whirlwind of human passions, Eras-

mus wrote to a member of Charles V's council: "Severity has often been tried in such cases and has always failed. Unless Luther is encountered calmly and reasonably a tremendous convulsion is inevitable."

Froude says of Erasmus: "The breadth of his culture, the worldly moderation of his temper seemed to qualify him above living men to conduct a reform. He saw that the system around him was pregnant with danger and he resolved to devote what remained to him of life" to such a reform. "We seem to be listening to the wisest of modern broad churchmen." It was the same breadth of view, based upon the learning of a high degree of civilization, which a century later, Roger Williams found during his stay in Holland. There he acquired the language of the Dutch and witnessed the actual functioning of civil and religious liberty. John Clarke, the great associate of Roger Williams, and through him the founder of Newport, was a student at the University of Leyden and brought to Rhode Island the same high conceptions. Indeed, the long stay

in The Netherlands of the English Puritans, who became the American Pilgrims, had an influence upon them of which we are still the beneficiaries.

The Reformation was much broader than the Puritan groupings, either on the Continent or in England. Political leaders saw that the zeal of religious malcontents could be employed with great advantage in the struggle for civil liberty. The Puritan party became composed, as are all political parties, of men varying in views and character, but its main tendency was toward democracy.

We can, for all practical purposes, trace the theological stream from its continental fountainheads as it penetrated throughout the center of Europe, reaching through France, Germany, Scandinavia, and especially Holland, into England.

Puritanism on the Continent and also in England began at the top, working downward, and what appears as a religious movement was then largely a political one. The statesmen who influenced the policy of Queen Eliza-

beth advocated reforms in the government of the Established Church which they considered important and even necessary in the interest of the state.

As the movement grew, motives aside from the purely religious or patriotic tended to influence an increasing number. "Many of wit and parts who could not obtain the preferment their ambition gaped at would declare themselves of the Puritan party; others that had neither learning or friends or opportunity to arrive at any preferments would put on a form of godliness, finding devout people that way so liberal to them that they could not hope to enrich themselves so much in any other way." L. Hutchinson, *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson.*

In all nations, in all communities, there is an evolution from what we term democracy to what we term aristocracy. When that development reaches its culmination, or, even as it approaches its final stages, there is a return to democracy, either by revolution or by less violent and more gradual steps. Services to

the country, when the sacrifice of life, or devotion to the state in any other form is involved, have created aristocracies, which have furnished many of the glories of a nation. But perfection in human affairs does not exist. Each system of government lends itself to abuses which may bring about its destruction.

Though we may realize the triumph of democracy now evident in every quarter of the globe, we may be unconscious of the process of evolution towards aristocracy and the devolution to returning democracy. A remarkable instance of this unconsciousness is a letter of a distinguished Frenchman, dated September 4, 1926. He refers to that date as memorable, "for it was on that day that my illustrious god-father, Napoleon III, was overthrown; a date which marks not only the end of an empire, but that of the old order. It also is the date marking the advent of the new order, that under which we live; an experiment, accompanied with anxiety and instability. Let us hope that human wisdom

will find the way to establish an equilibrium for the new order."

The deep regret expressed by him at the destruction of the Empire and the advent of the Republic, is written upon paper stamped with the well-known motto of his family. The motto dates from the time of the first Capetian King, "Re que Diou," meaning in the French of that period, "No King but God." The incident which brought about the adoption of the motto arose during a siege in which the King found himself opposed by an equally powerful leader, to whom he sent word: "Who made you Count?" The reply was, "Who made you King? There is no King but God!"

The return to the democratic French Republic was a complete vindication of the originator of the motto, a fact his descendant does not seem to have realized.

The re-echo of "Re que Diou," over six hundred years later, is recalled in the incident mentioned by John Fiske, *The Beginnings of New England.*

"The feelings with which the late queen (Elizabeth) had regarded Puritanism were mild compared with the sentiments entertained by her successor. For some years he had been getting worsted in his struggle with the Presbyterians of the northern kingdom. His vindictive memory treasured up the day when a mighty Puritan preacher had in public twitched him by the sleeve and called him 'God's silly vassal.' 'I tell you, sir,' said Andrew Melville on that occasion, 'there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King, and his kingdom the Kirk, whose subject James VI is, and of whose kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. And they whom Christ hath called to watch over his kirk and govern his spiritual kingdom have sufficient power and authority so to do both together and severally.'" In these words we have the whole political philosophy of the Democratic principle of the separation of church and state.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS WARS

PART II

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS WARS

WE cannot assume that we understand the present, interwoven as it is with the past, or the motives actuating those preceding us, unless we are willing, even though it be briefly, to consider what history has recorded.

Systems of government, especially those involving a State religion, vitally affect the daily relations of men to their fellowmen. History repeatedly shows that in conflicts of systems of government men are willing to sacrifice their lives, and that religious wars are the most cruel and violent.

The American wilderness had been untrodden by white men while for centuries religious and political conflicts were being waged in

Europe. The religious wars with their background of political, financial, commercial, and dynastic ambitions and rivalries dwarfed, in length of time, in cruelty, atrocity, and ferocious torture, every form of human suffering that was experienced in the last Great War.

Whatever opinions may be held as to causes leading up to that war, its outstanding result, the destruction of the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg dynasties of Central Europe, the substitution of republican forms of government there and elsewhere, and the extension of democratic principles throughout existing monarchies, leaves no doubt that the conflict of antagonistic systems—the theory of the Divine Right to rule and the democratic principle—was one of the chief underlying causes.

During Europe's colonizing period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the drama of human passion, political ambition and avarice was unfolded there on an infinitely larger scale, appealing to the imagination by the tragic magnificence of its setting. In con-

trast, were the rude and severe surroundings of the colonial settlements, especially that element, which, though broadened by transplanting, had before its arrival assumed it a virtue to despise everything it did not possess or lacked the capacity to enjoy. The Puritans in England were, at the time of the settlement, a very small body, hostile to the aristocracy and equally so to the laboring class. From this source the English middle class had become the chief colonizing element and has now, in England, grown to be more powerful, in wealth and political influence, than either of the other two.

The immense strides in the development of the power of England under the policies of the Elizabethan reign led to the expeditions organized by the Crown, and the history of Virginia, especially, brings its early settlement into the closest relations with the most glorious and interesting period of European civilization.

The other powerful and rival monarchies of Europe contributed their share to the romance

and dramatic pageantry of American history, by similar expeditions. The Renaissance was the Rebirth of Europe, renewing literature, art, science, its strength and activity in every form, overflowing into other continents, in an adventurous and colonizing spirit, through voyages of exploration and conquest. The political tragedies of Europe were transferred to our shores and re-enacted in the wilds of America. American history is filled with the light and color of Europe's most eventful periods.

RIVAL EXPLORATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS[1]

All of North America was claimed by three contestants—Spain, France and England. Spain asserted dominion over the entire Western world beyond the line established by the treaty of Tordesillas. The first governor of New France was Samuel Champlain, who died in Quebec 1635. Henry IV gave him the title of general lieutenant of Canada and

[1] See Appendix.

charged him to send to France a faithful account of his mission, which he published in 1603 under the title *Des Sauvages.* Upon the death of Henry IV, the queen regent appointed Charles of Bourbon nominal governor of New France, who appointed Champlain, with extensive powers. That appointment was continued under the prince of Condé. Champlain was called the father of New France and personified the colonizing policy of Richelieu, under Louis XIII. The Marquise de Guercheville and the Jesuit Fathers received the grant of all of the continent from Florida to the St. Lawrence. Adrian Guilbert in his application to Queen Elizabeth asked leave to inhabit all places discovered between the equator and the North Pole. (F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World.*)

The title to newly acquired lands originally derived validity from the Pope's sanction and even, in English opinion, had come to rest on the right of discovery. In 1483, Pope Alexander VI issued a bull, declaring that all the territories newly discovered should be divided

between Spain and Portugal. The conquest of Mexico by Spain in 1521, a century before the landing of the Pilgrims, was the beginning of the Spanish empire in America.

The Spanish commander, Menendez, as Captain General of the Fleet, had brought troops to Flanders and, two years later, commanded the Armada. Afterwards he was empowered to conquer and settle Florida at his own cost. On receiving word that part of Florida was already occupied by French Huguenots, under Ribaut, he sailed to put an end to the "heretics, foes of God and liegemen of the devil," who had founded a colony at St. John's. He succeeded, and the motive for the massacre was proclaimed by him, in the statement that the French Colonists were killed, "not as Frenchmen, but as heretics." He then founded St. Augustine, as a Spanish colony.

In 1568, De Gourges, a Frenchman, led a punitive expedition, which killed all the Spaniards on the St. John's River, "not as Spaniards, but as murderers."

It was in 1524 that Francis I of France, in

order to counterbalance the power of Charles V, which had extended throughout the world, fitted out the expedition under Verrazano. The American Atlantic coast was explored from Cape Fear upward, and, though no permanent settlement was established, the possession of this immense extent of territory was formally claimed, in the name of the King of France, as New France.

In the century preceding the settlements at Jamestown and at Plymouth, a third of the known globe was ruled by Charles V of Austria and Spain. In 1476, sixteen years before the first voyage of Columbus, the Battle of Morat had changed the face of Europe, politically and commercially.

At that battle, on the borders of a Swiss lake, to the astonishment of Europe, the armored knights and army of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, were destroyed by Swiss infantrymen. The result was the consolidation of the power of the French monarchy under Louis XI. Much more far reaching was the absorption of the whole of Bur-

gundy by the Imperial House of Austria, the Hapsburg dynasty, which had its origin in the Swiss Counts of Hapsburg (German, Habsburg, Habichtsburg or Hawks' Castle).

After the battle, the marriage of Mary, daughter of Charles the Bold of Burgundy, to the Emperor Maximilian of Austria, prepared the way for the Spanish rule over The Netherlands. The son of Maximilian, Philip of Burgundy, Archduke of Austria, married the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. His son, Charles V, Emperor of Austria and King of Spain as Charles I, was born in Ghent, in 1500. By the death of his father, Philip, in 1506, he became heir to the vast possessions of the House of Hapsburg, through his paternal grandfather, the Emperor Maximilian. Through his paternal grandmother, Mary, he inherited the sovereignty, or Dukedom, of Burgundy, afterwards the Spanish Netherlands. By the death, in 1516, of Ferdinand, the Catholic, he inherited the Kingdom of Spain, the Kingdom of Naples, and all the boundless empire of Spain in America. He

was educated in The Netherlands and thoroughly instructed in all that was essential to the conduct of affairs of state. At manhood he was the mightiest, the wealthiest and the most powerful monarch in the world, the Spanish domination overshadowing every other existing power. Under Charles V the Spanish army was the most formidable in the world. Its equipment and training excelled that of any other. It was compared to the Roman Legions and was considered invincible.

Historians generally agree that had Charles of Burgundy been the victor at the Battle of Morat, his realm, already equal to any existing kingdom, would have continued its development and have reached imperial and world wide proportions. From the sources of the most advanced degree of civilization, spreading from Italian and Southern Europe northward, through the great river arteries, the Rhine and the Rhone, into Flanders and The Netherlands, the Duchy of Burgundy had become the heart of Europe. All the splendors of the Renaissance were reflected in

its great cities. In Bruges there were 52 Guilds; in Ghent, 59, and so with other cities. The Guilds originated in the Roman Collegia. They were during the Middle Ages specially devoted to commerce and industry. They were also organized into military companies. In the Battle of the Spurs, waged against Philip of France, the armed forces of the cities gained a victory over the military power of feudalism. This greatly increased the military prestige of all the other large cities of the continent, and Antwerp became the commercial capital of the world. Even the defeat did not prevent Burgundy and Holland from remaining the most flourishing and highly civilized countries of that brilliant epoch.

RICHELIEU FOUNDER OF FRANCE'S COLONIAL POLICY

After the dark period of what we call the Middle Ages the influence of commerce, along the navigable rivers, spread everywhere during the Renaissance—the Rebirth of Europe.

There is even today a navigation company in France possessing in its archives the account of the voyage of Catherine of Medici, in a river craft drawn by a large number of horses with royal pomp and magnificence. The voyage of the Duke of Richelieu, Prime Minister of Louis XIII and the originator of France's colonial policy, is a familiar page of history.

An account of the voyage, the subject of the great picture by Paul de la Roche, is given by Henri Robert, the French barrister (bâtonnier), member of the French Academy, in the story of the trial and execution of Cinq-Mars for conspiracy against the life of the Cardinal, *The Great Trials of History.* The accused conspirators, Cinq-Mars and de Thou, were brought by Richelieu himself in a barge from Tarascon to Lyons, by the river Rhone. The description of the dying Cardinal, traveling with all the ceremony and state of a prince of the church, is taken from contemporaneous accounts of the voyage, cited by Alfred de Vigny:

"The Cardinal was drawn in a barge upon

which had been constructed a large room furnished in scarlet velvet, into which he was carried by 18 of his guards. In the chamber, near the bed on which Richelieu was lying, there was a great table covered with documents. A secretary, to whom he dictated, gave him the substance. In the bow and in the stern of the vessel were a number of soldiers in the scarlet uniform of the Cardinal.

"Another vessel acted as an advance guard and immediately after still another was filled with archers. There was a small vessel in which the prisoners, Cinq-Mars and de Thou, were guarded by an officer of the King and 12 soldiers belonging to His Eminence. On the Dauphiné side of the Rhone there were two companies of cavalry and the same number on the Vivarais side. There was a fine regiment of infantry which entered into the cities where His Eminence spent the night. It gave pleasure to hear the trumpets as they sounded on the Dauphiné side and the answers from the Vivarais banks re-echoed from our rocks.

"A singularly impressive spectacle, striking

terror among the people on both sides the Rhone, was this of the Cardinal prime minister, at death's door, dying on his scarlet couch, surrounded with this imposing exhibition of power, dragging to punishment and death these two young men, powerful yesterday, but whose crime had caused them to fall from so high estate. It was the 3rd of September, 1642, that the Cardinal and his two prisoners arrived in Lyons. It was three months after the execution of Cinq-Mars that Richelieu received the last sacrament, and when told by the priest, 'You must forgive your enemies,' the great Cardinal replied, 'I never had any enemies but those of France.'" To the last day of his life Richelieu never lost sight of his New France in America.

QUEEN ELIZABETH AND THE RELIGIOUS WAR

Upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Parliament had enacted laws hostile to the Catholics, the Pope having refused to recognize her title to the throne. She would have

been without any party in the state had she not allied herself with the Reformers. Froude remarks that she told the Spanish Ambassador she was as good a Catholic as he was and had been compelled to act as she did. In 1561, at the time she desired to marry Lord Dudley, the Spanish Ambassador was informed that if the marriage could be brought about through the influence of Philip, the Catholic religion would be restored. It was the opposition of the Catholic nobles of England to this marriage that made Lord Dudley a friend of the Puritans.

In 1566 the Pope offered to recognize the legitimacy of Elizabeth, reversing the former decree relating to the divorce of her father, Henry VIII, if she would re-establish the Roman Catholic church. In 1573, and again in 1578, she told the Spanish Ambassador that she held the Catholic creed herself and that her differences with her Catholic subjects were purely political. When more securely established on the throne, she forbade Parliament to interfere in matters of religion. Her ad-

visers inclined more toward Protestantism and resisted all attempts to the establishment of Catholicism. It was on that account that when Philip organized the Armada he made out a list of English statesmen to be hanged after the expected victory.

In 1576 she threatened to make war on the Prince of Orange, and this would have meant reconciliation with Rome.

Here as in innumerable instances we find the political interest first and the religious motive second.

WILLIAM THE SILENT

Prince William of Orange, born in 1523, was at 15 years of age a page of Charles V. On account of his marked personality and brilliant intellect he became a great favorite at the court. At 18 years of age he was a Councillor of the Empire, and at 21 he commanded an army.

Upon the abdication of Charles V, and under his successor, Philip II, William of

Orange was sent to the court of France. One day when accompanying the King, at a hunting party, who supposed that the Prince had the confidence of Philip, informed him that the two monarchs had come to an understanding to put an end by military power and severest punitive measures to the heresies that were known to exist in Holland. It was then that William of Orange decided to give his life to his country.

From that moment he, who became known as William the Silent, bound himself to a cause which his exceptional clearness of intellect recognized as involving a prolonged and desperate struggle with a nation then the most dominant power in the world. His great moral and physical courage never wavered in the face of odds which he did not for a moment underestimate. The motto he had selected remained the unchanging rule of a life of devotion to the cause of his country, ending with the tragedy of his death:

"Je n'ai pas besoin d'espérer pour entreprendre
Ni de réussir pour persévérer."

"I have no need of hope to undertake nor of success to persevere."

In 1548, seven years before the abdication of Charles V, his son Philip went from province to province in the low countries and swore to respect all the rights and privileges in those states. In Holland, he swore "to maintain in all truth all the privileges, the liberties of the nobles, the cities, the villages, the subjects, the clergy of the province of Holland, of Friesland, of the Southwest, which were given by my ancestors to the Counts of Holland; and moreover, their customs, usages and rights that they have today."

The father and grandfather of Philip II had sworn to maintain these privileges and agreements recognized by the House of Burgundy, but Philip II went further and bound himself to maintain all the privileges that had been granted by his predecessors. His forefathers had been faithful to their promises, but not he. He endeavored to set aside the rights of his subjects and to establish taxes

without their consent. It was especially on that account that the people of The Netherlands demanded the recognition of all their privileges, and this led to the founding of the Dutch Republic.

Philip II appointed William of Orange Stadtholder of Holland, of Zeeland and the province of Utrecht. The seventeen provinces were at the outset distinct nationalities. By conquest, purchase and marriage they came under the sovereignty of the Dukes of Burgundy in 1384. Their rights were recognized by written charters and were always well defended, not only by their armed forces, but by their spirit of independence. There were early marked tendencies toward democracy, especially in Holland and Friesland.

While the Huguenots in France and the Reformers in The Netherlands were engaged against overwhelming odds in the war for religious liberty, the Protestants of Germany were comparatively inactive. It was in its early stages that the Reformation was active in Germany; in its later stages in England,

and in both its early and late stages in France. The policy of Queen Elizabeth and her advisers was to keep aloof, the French and Dutch Reformers were considered rebels against the French and Spanish monarchies. The collapse of the Spanish Armada in 1588, coupled with the success of the Protestants in Holland and of Henry IV in France, produced a complete reversal in the attitude of the Queen.

She had made her peace with Spain, and the Protestant reformers looked for assistance to France, where a large and influential body of Protestants was led by Admiral Coligny. He had obtained influence over the young King Charles IX, making him realize that it was to the interest of France to check the power of Spain. The religious war had ended and the marriage had been arranged between Henry of Navarre and the sister of the King. The Huguenots had assembled at Paris to witness the ceremony. The Protestants were expecting that the support of France would then be given to the Dutch Protestant rebellion against Spain.

The mother of the King, Catherine of Medici, resented the ascendancy of Coligny. She was equally opposed to the extreme Catholics and extreme Protestants, considering that both factions threatened the peace and greatness of the kingdom. Her policy was to take sides against Spain and the Papacy, but that could not be carried out without the aid of England.

The advisers of Queen Elizabeth had urged the alliance with the Huguenots of France and the Protestants of The Netherlands. Catherine believed that the plan would be successful. She had consented, in defiance of the Pope, to the marriage of her daughter to a Protestant. Her troops were to go, under the command of Coligny, to the assistance of the Prince of Orange. Suddenly came the intelligence that Queen Elizabeth was not to enter a French alliance, and was, apparently, not actuated by hostility to Spain.

The Huguenots were demanding war with Spain and the Papacy, but the population, by a large majority, was Catholic. Deprived of

the expected aid of Elizabeth, Catherine determined that Coligny, still urging upon the King the Protestant cause, should be assassinated. The assassin shot at the great commander, but succeeded only in severely wounding him. Catherine, fearing vengeance, determined to exterminate the Huguenot leaders. The King at first was reluctant to acquiesce in the plot to put Coligny to death who was held in such high esteem by his subjects. Upon the appeal of his mother, on account of the danger to herself and to the throne from an uprising of the Huguenots, he yielded, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew followed.

The violent passions of a religious war found vent in the acclamations of approval in Spain and in the Te Deums sung in honor of what was considered a victory. In England, the news was received with horror. The court went into mourning, but The Netherlands remained without assistance. The French Ambassador to Spain, congratulating Philip, said that the work on St. Bartholomew's day had

saved for Spain continued control over The Netherlands.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN THE NETHERLANDS

No one believed that The Netherlands would be compelled to contend alone against Spain, it having been understood that England and especially France would come to their aid against the Spanish persecutions. During a few years the Count of Anjou, brother of the King of France, had been their sovereign, but he was not capable of filling his rôle. At his death the Catholic party commenced its war against the heretics.

The Prince of Orange was excommunicated and declared an outlaw; his property was confiscated. Philip II, perceiving the consequences in England resulting from the death of Cromwell, thought that the same results could be accomplished in The Netherlands by the death of William the Silent. It was known that, with a family of eleven children, and hav-

ing expended his fortune in the service of his country, the Prince of Orange was in desperate financial difficulty. Philip proposed to bribe him by the payment of his debts and the gift of a million crowns. This was refused. It was then that Philip declared that whoever would deliver him from "this pest" would have a full pardon for all his crimes and would be ennobled for his bravery. At the first attempt the Prince received a pistol wound which pierced his neck and broke his jaw. There were three more attempts at his assassination. The fifth was successful. He was murdered by Balthasar Gerard. The consequence of the assassination proved to Philip that he had been mistaken in supposing that the revolt in The Netherlands would end with the life of William of Orange.

Upon the death of Cromwell and the loss of its military leader, the Commonwealth died with him. The revolutionists who had decapitated the Stuart believed they could establish a republic such as existed in the United Provinces of The Netherlands. But they had not

been engaged in a war against a foreign oppressor, and the rights they had asserted had not sufficiently taken root when the counter revolution for the Restoration occurred.

The revolt of The Netherlands was against a foreign power and the revolutionists, though deprived of their commander, were determined not to make peace with Spain. On the day of the assassination the Estates of Holland resolved "to maintain the good cause, with God's help, to the uttermost without sparing gold or blood."

With the fall of Antwerp in 1585, after the cities of Bruges, Ghent, Brussels and Mechlin, the prospects for religious and civil liberty in Europe were very dark. The Austrian Emperor was the nephew and brother-in-law of Philip of Spain. The Protestant princes of Germany were apathetic, being Lutherans, the Calvinists were to them as obnoxious as the Catholics. Spain was establishing universal dominion. In 1580 Portugal was conquered, in a campaign which nearly doubled the power of Spain. Portugal had been acquiring terri-

tories in Africa, India and the Pacific Islands, settlements bringing more wealth to the mother country than the vast American colonies of Spain. The Portuguese possessions were transferred to the King of Spain and with them the only navy that then rivalled his own. Spain claimed the mastery of the Pacific as well as of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. The Spanish armies under Alva had subdued all of the Netherland provinces, excepting part of Holland and Zeeland. France, by the active diplomacy and under the pressure of Spain, was prevented from interfering.

It was at this moment a policy of reconciliation was based on the restoration of civil liberty provided the Dutch gave up their religious contentions. Such a peace would have benefited the commerce of the Netherlands, and it was for this reason that the Dutch obstinacy in regard to religious freedom seemed so incomprehensible to a large portion of Europe.

The Republic was then born, though its presence was not yet fully realized. An execu-

tive council was appointed with Prince Maurice of Orange, son of William the Silent, whose mother was the daughter of Coligny, as commander in chief of the armies. William of Orange, grandson of Frederick Henry and Stadtholder of the United Provinces, became King of England as William the III.

Political considerations were deeply involved in the war for the independence of The Netherlands, lasting 80 years, and the civil war in France from 1550 to 1594. The conflict for the throne of France resulted in the assassination of Henry III, in the interest of the Duke of Guise, who represented the Catholic influence. Philip II of Spain openly aided him, planning that his daughter should through his ascendancy inherit the French crown. Henry IV, brother-in-law of the murdered King, sided with the Protestants against the power of Spain. The Catholic influences consequently declared that Henry IV was not qualified to succeed to the throne of France, and it was only after his military successes at the Battle of Coutras that the Spanish forces were

driven out of Paris. Though the leader in the cause of Protestantism he, in order to establish himself securely upon the throne, finally embraced Catholicism.

BUT ONE RELIGION TOLERATED IN THE STATE

Religious toleration was unknown at the time, it was believed there could be only one religion in the state. To practice any religion but that of the state was treason to the state and punishable as treason.

Madison to Edward Livingston, July 10, 1822, *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison:* "It was the belief of all sects at one time that the establishment of religion by law was right and necessary; that the true religion ought to be established in exclusion of every other; and that the only question to be decided was, which was the true religion? The example of Holland proves that a toleration of sects dissenting from the established sects was safe and even useful. The example of the Colonies, now States, which rejected religious establishments alto-

gether, proved that all sects might be safely and advantageously put on a footing of equal and entire freedom. It is impossible to deny that in Virginia religion prevails with more zeal and a more exemplary priesthood than it ever did when established and patronized by public authority. We are teaching the world the great truth that governments do better without kings and nobles than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson, that religion flourishes in greater purity without than with the aid of government."

In 1521, four years after Luther began his controversy with Rome, Charles V, in accordance with the accepted theory that rulers should determine the religion of their subjects, issued an edict regulating religion in The Netherlands where the Reformation was commencing:

"As it appears that the aforesaid Martin is not a man, but a devil under the form of a man, and clothed in the dress of a priest, the better to bring the human race to hell and damnation.

"Therefore all his disciples and converts are to be punished with death and forfeiture of all of their goods."

The edict of Worms also declared:

"Considering that matters have taken this course and that Martin Luther has in obstinacy and perverseness continued to remain in his evidently heretical opinions and has therefore been considered by all those who fear God and have some sense, as a man without any sense or one that is possessed by the evil spirit, accordingly we have in keeping with our safe conduct permitted him to leave on the twenty-fifth day of April and have granted him another twenty days counting from the twenty-fifth of April which conduct after that time becomes invalid and after that we are going to proceed against this venomous mania as follows: In the first place we command that all ye, particularly all princes, estates and subjects shall not after the expiration of the above twenty days which terminate on the fourteenth of the present month of May, offer to Luther either shelter, food or drink nor help him in

any way with words or deeds secretly or openly. On the contrary whenever you shall get possession of him you shall at once put him into prison and send him over to me, or at any rate inform me thereof without any delay. For that holy work you will be recompensed for your trouble and expenses. Likewise you ought in virtue of the holy constitution and of the ban of our empire to deal in the following manner with all the partisans, abettors and patrons of Luther. You shall put them down and confiscate their estates to your own profit unless the said persons can prove that they have mended their ways and have asked for papal absolution.

"Furthermore we commend under the aforesaid punishments that nobody shall buy, sell, read, keep, copy or print any of the writings of Martin Luther which have been condemned by our holy father the Pope whether in Latin or German nor any of his other writings that are wicked; nor shall you accept his opinions, nor preach them nor protect them. . . . Likewise you shall help and assist the legates and

commissioners of his holiness the Pope in everything that they shall desire. . . . And likewise we command very seriously under the aforesaid punishments all our justices and judges to have the aforesaid writings, books and pictures, already published or to be published, collected all through our Roman empire and have them torn to pieces and publicly burnt . . . and in order that this shall be executed and shall receive credence we have added to this letter our imperial seal given in our and the holy Empire's town Worms, on the eighth day of May in the year 1521, of our Empire the second and of our Realm's the sixth year."

The scepter which at that moment ruled the world was a rod of iron in the hand of an Emperor, who, of the rulers of that period, represented the most advanced civilization.

The Duke of Alva declared that better a ruined kingdom, true to itself and its King, than one left unharmed to the profit of the devil and heretics. Prescott, *History of the Reign of Philip II.* And again "a prince could not do a thing more unworthy, or preju-

dicial to himself, than to grant a liberty of conscience to the people." Davila, *The History of the Civil Wars of France.*

Under his rule in The Netherlands the Protestants suffered death as traitors. In England, upon the approach of the Armada, and later, Catholics were tried and sentenced to immediate execution, nothing being charged against them except the practice of their religion. They met the barbarous death inflicted upon traitors, being cut down from the gallows and disemboweled. "The church and the Queen its refounder, are clear of persecution as regards the Catholics. No church, sect, no individual even, had yet professed the principle of toleration." Southey, *Book of the Church.*

While it is true that religious toleration was then unknown, a statute declaring the practice of religion punishable as an act of treason is undoubtedly religious persecution.

Wherever there was a state religion, the rulers of the state held that within it but one religion could be tolerated; that to recognize any other would have a disturbing influence;

that order in the state required the recognition of but one religion. It was not until secured by force of arms that freedom of conscience and religious liberty became possible.

INFLUENCES OF NETHERLANDS ON AMERICA

PART III

INFLUENCES OF NETHERLANDS ON AMERICA

THERE are few things more difficult than to view history with an appreciation of the relative and marked differences that existed in the seventeenth century among the countries and peoples that founded our American commonwealth. This is especially the case now that civilization throughout the western world is constantly approaching a universal level of similarity.

To-day the British Empire's position is so advanced that it is almost impossible to picture the England which looked upon the Dutch Republic as a formidable rival in commerce and manufacture, in many respects more successful.

The effect upon the English Puritans and

the New England Pilgrims in the seventeenth century of the proximity of a great and powerful republic is evident. The period in which the Dutch Republic came to its maturity is the most important in the history of modern Europe preceding the changes ushered in by the French Revolution.

"The revolt of The Netherlands and the success of Holland are the beginnings of modern political science and of modern civilization. (Thorold Rogers, *History of Holland.*)

Speaking of the aspect of Holland in 1685, Macaulay says that it "produced on English travelers of that age an effect similar to the effect which the first sight of England now (in Macaulay's time) produces on a Norwegian or a Canadian."[1]

Douglas Campbell says: "If an American of the present generation could go back to the Dutch Republic of two and a half centuries ago he would find himself in a familiar land, because he would be among a people of the

[1] History of The Netherlands, Vol. 1, Ch. 2.

Nineteenth century. In that period in England, France, or Germany he would be in the land of the Seventeenth century.

The English Puritan first became known as such in the early days of Elizabeth. Motley in the *Life of Barneveld* speaks of the Puritans in Holland and England as holding the same opinions. Their religious beliefs had their origin in the Reformation.

The Reformation in The Netherlands began among the artisans in the cities and the farmers in the rural districts. Many of them driven out of Holland by the war took refuge in England. Those parts of England where the Dutch weavers settled and where Wyclif preached were subjected to their influence. One district in Lincolnshire was known by the name of "Holland." The Dutch laid the foundations of the weaving industry which made Norwich the second city in England. During the persecutions of the Lollards more persons suffered at the stake in Norfolk than in all the other counties in England put together.

Taine, *Art in the Netherlands,* speaking of the early part of the Seventeenth century, says that "in art and in education, as in organization and the methods of government, Holland was two centuries in advance of the other countries of Europe."

At the time of the Stuarts the Dutch Republic possessed an extensive commerce and manufactures of all descriptions and advanced methods of agriculture, banks and hospitals, far beyond what existed in other countries. They also had religious toleration, universal education and a free press.

Settlers of New England had been living under such influences in the Netherland Republic. Coming to America they brought with them the idea of a system of republican institutions. William Penn's mother was born in Rotterdam. The founder of Pennsylvania was, like Roger Williams, a thorough Dutch scholar. He preached to the Quakers of Holland in their native tongue. In 1778, Franklin wrote: "In the love of liberty and bravery in defense of it Holland has been our great

example." *(Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution.)* The Netherland Republic lasted until 1794 when it fell under the blows of Napoleon, who made it a monarchy in 1806.

The amendment to the Constitution that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States" was adopted in 1791, preventing the enactment of any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Writing of this amendment, Madison said: "The example of Holland proved that a toleration of sects dissenting from the established sect was safe and even useful." (Letters of James Madison.) The seven Protestant Provinces were bound together by the Treaty, or Union of Utrecht. This document became the written constitution of the Netherland Republic. Undoubtedly the principle of a written constitution in Holland together with Charters of the English Crown were the precursors of our written constitution. They furnished the basis of the

"Fundamental Orders" adopted in 1639 by the Towns along the Connecticut River, which has been considered as the first written American Constitution.

In his address to the American Bar Association at Minneapolis, in August, 1923, Lord Birkenhead said: "No service is rendered to Anglo-American relations by exaggerating the debt which you owe either to our Constitution or to our jurisprudence.[1] . . . For herein lies the fundamental difference between your constitution and ours. Your constitution is expressed and defined in documents which can be pronounced upon by the Supreme Court. This circumstance provides a breakwater of enormous value against ill-considered and revolutionary changes . . . it happens that practically no law in Great Britain is constitutional, in the sense in which you have a con-

[1] "The whole theory of government in the two countries (England and the United States) has always been radically different. Under such conditions it was but natural that our forefathers should turn for their precedents, not to a monarchy or an aristocracy, but to a republic." (Douglas Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, England and America.*)

stitution. Any law in Great Britain can be altered by any Parliament and no court may challenge the constitutional force of any acts of Parliament."

In appreciating the influences of The Netherlands upon the Puritanism of England during the century preceding the Puritan settlement on the Atlantic coast, it is essential to keep in mind the fact that it was largely confined to the learned and the powerful statesmen of the Elizabethan period. In the early Seventeenth it had been partially abandoned by the ruling class and was confining itself to the middle class and the poor. The development of the Quakers, the Baptists, and later the Methodists was the outgrowth of this condition. Under the Stuarts the theology of the Reformation was repudiated by the prelates and the courtiers. (Macaulay.)

Upon the fall of the Stuarts, England, under the Commonwealth was ruled chiefly by the small landed proprietors and merchants. They differed from the scholarly reformers of the Sixteenth century.

We have already seen that The Netherlands led the movement from the beginning, but after the restoration of the Stuarts, and again, on account of the reaction after the revolution of 1688, the ruling class in England was hostile to Republican Holland. Commercial rivalry added its influence. Chancellor Shaftsbury, in a speech in Parliament, declared that the Dutch Republic was the enemy of all monarchies, especially the English; that the Dutch Republic was their only competitor in commerce and naval power and was the chief obstacle to the universal dominion which England should aim at. Such a government must be destroyed. (Parliamentary History.)

A curious light is thrown upon the subject even at a later period. In Webster's *Foreign Policy of Lord Castlereagh,*[1] we find that the

[1] In 1816, the British Missions were divided into seven classes, of which The Hague, Petersburg, Vienna, Madrid, Paris, and Constantinople were filled by Ambassadors. C. K. Webster in "The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh," published 1925, in a note on page 42 says that in 1822, The salaries attached to the various missions, including house rent, were as follows:

salary of the British Ambassador at The Hague was higher than at any other capital: 12,300 pounds; in Paris, 11,000 pounds, etc.

The mutual influence of England and Holland upon each other is obvious. It was rendered inevitable by the circumstances of the time and existed for a long period previous to the residence in Holland of those English Puritans who afterwards settled in America. The religious wars and the occupation by Spain of the Netherlands brought many refugees to England. In 1560 it was estimated that there were 10,000 of them from Flanders with their ministers and preachers. In 1562 the number had increased to over 40,000. (Reports of the Spanish Ambassador, Froude.) Davies, Holland, says that before the termination of Alva's persecution of the Protestants

---

The Hague, 12,300 (pounds); Vienna, Petersburg and Madrid, 12,000; Paris, 11,000; Constantinople, 8,000; Berlin, 7,500; Rio de Janeiro, Naples, Washington and Frankfurt, 6,000; Stockholm, Munich, Copenhagen, Turin, 4,900; Stuttgart, Florence and Dresden, 3,900; Lisbon, 1,645; Berne, 1,595, etc.

over 100,000 heads of families had left the Netherlands, the majority of whom found a home in England. (Greene puts the number at over 50,000: *History of the English People.* A census taken by the Lord Mayor of London in 1568, the year after Alva's arrival in The Netherlands, shows that of 6,704 foreigners in the city 5,225 were from the Low Countries. Queen Elizabeth did not encourage their remaining in London, where at a later date they came in such numbers as to attract the notice of the Spanish Ambassador and they were therefore dispersed throughout the country. They settled by dozens in Hastings, Dover, Sandwhich, Romney, Hythe. *(Greene's History of the English People.)* In Sandwich there were 351 Netherland families in 1582.

They took no part in public affairs. They were not theologians, they were artisans. There was but little manufacture in England at that time, except the weaving of some coarse grades of cloth. The Dutch brought much knowledge of the mechanical arts. In London they made window glass, pins and

needles, beaver hats, gloves and fine furniture; in Colchester, needles and parchment; in Plymouth, and elsewhere in Devonshire, Flemish lace; in Fulham, tapestry; in Maidstone, linen thread; in Sheffield, steel and iron; in Sandwich, Leeds and Norwich, serges, flannels and silks. (Goldby's *England of Shakespeare.*)

Later another class of emigrants came from the Netherlands. They were merchants and represented the commercial activity of Holland, which had been cultivated for centuries. After the fall of Antwerp and the banishment of the Protestants, it was estimated that a third of the population of that city were to be seen on the London Exchange. They came from a land where education was universal. It was in London and in Norwich that they made their most important settlements, and these were the chief strongholds of the Puritans. From Norwich, the first Brownist's or Separatists' colony went to Holland and it was in the adjoining county of Lincoln that those known as the Pilgrim Fathers organized their first congregation.

EARLY PERMANENT SETTLEMENTS

It was more than a century later that the early English settlements on our Atlantic coast commenced, the first permanent settlement being the Virginia Colony under James I, the second the landing at Plymouth in 1620.

"There had for some time been growing up into prominence a new class, which we now call the middle class and which had had no assigned position under the feudal form of society. In the Stuart period, this class was, for the first time, to impress its character deeply upon national affairs. The activities by which, during the preceding two centuries or more, its members had been gradually rising into their new position had given a marked quality to their minds and characters. Looked down upon by the noble, and disliked by the peasant, they returned these feelings with interest. They condemned the immorality of those above them. The element of negation entered, and the Puritan fostered an ideal which was the reverse of the lives of those

who looked down upon him." *The Founding of New England,* J. T. Adams.

The early days of the Puritans or Pilgrims have often been considered as beginning on this side of the ocean, but the historians of to-day generally start with the events in England leading up to the emigration. A broader and more accurate view, taking into account the stream of continental immigration in the past into the British Isles, compels us not only to cross the ocean to England, but to cross the channel into France and The Netherlands, through those countries into Spain and Italy, and to cross the North Sea to the Scandinavian and Germanic peoples.

James Truslow Adams, *Founding of New England,* says in regard to the great migration: "As our eyes are usually fastened on this side of the water we are apt to think of the Puritans and the Pilgrims and other immigrants as starting their careers by coming here. It is no disparagement of the courage with which they faced the wilderness to think of them as Englishmen abandoning their place

in the struggle at home, and to consider the type of mind which preferred to exchange the simplification of unpeopled America for the complexities of the situation in England."

What J. T. Adams says is confined to the migration from England. It might be broadened to include similar migrations from Continental Europe, as well as from Insular and Anglo-Celtic Europe. He did well to cite the case of John Winthrop, whose motives for emigration were explained by himself. He, as Adams says, "was the purest, gentlest, broadest-minded of all who were to guide the destinies of the Bay Colony."

R. C. Winthrop, *Life and Letters of John Winthrop,* in the Memoranda of Particular Considerations in the Case of J. W.: "His means here are so shortened (now five of his sons being come of age have drawn away the one-half of his estate) as he shall not be able to continue to be in that place and employment where he now is, his ordinary charge being still as great almost as when his means were doubled. . . . If he let pass this oppor-

tunity, that talent which God hath bestowed upon him for public service is like to be buried. With what comfort can I live with seven or eight servants in that peace and condition where for many years I have spent from three to four hundred pounds yearly and maintain a greater charge."

John Winthrop was in his forty-third year. He was a small officeholder under the government. R. C. Winthrop says, his grandfathers, paternal and maternal, were clothiers; that is, men who employed weavers in their shops. He came from the county of Suffolk, which, like Norfolk, was settled by Dutch refugees, who followed their trade as weavers, in the small towns.

In 1629 he wrote to his son Henry, at that time a settler in Barbados, that he owed more than he was able to pay without selling his land, and throughout all his letters and papers of the period runs, as J. T. Adams says, the same strain of anxiety over money matters, although possessed of a modest estate, which when subsequently sold, realized 4,200 pounds.

R. C. Winthrop, *Life and Letters of John Winthrop.*

The demands of a large family and the increased cost of living were more than he could meet. He was in addition deprived of his office under the Master of the Wards, and wrote to his wife, "Where shall we spend the rest of our short tyme, I know not. The Lorde, I trust, will direct us in mercye."

About this time a paper containing arguments for settling in New England was circulated among the Puritans. The first reason dwelt upon was the glory of opposing the French Jesuits in Canada and of raising a particular church in New England. The second reason referred to the cost of living, which in England had "growne to that height of intemperance in all excesse of riott as noe man's estate allmost will suffice to keepe saile with his æqualls." *Life and Letters of John Winthrop.*

THE MASSACHUSETTS THEOCRACY

The motives actuating the emigrants were

varied, though the principal influences were religious, political and economic. The founding of the theocracy of Massachusetts was the merging of these three elements into one ruling oligarchy.

The influences creating intolerance are manifold. Intolerance may be founded upon the belief that toleration means indifference to religion or the lack of it. A religious fanatic would, of course, be intolerant and would probably advocate or take part in persecutions, accompanied with all the horrors which history depicts. Men of that description became the mere instruments of the higher degree of intellect possessed by the statesmen and military commanders who employed them.

A century later, on our side of the Atlantic, the same influences were apparent, though the scale was diminished. The theocracy was composed of men under the influences of their own time, as all men are. Human nature does not change, though customs and codes of morals do. The merging of the powers of State and Church, under all the dynasties then existing

under the theory of Divine Right, was the major cause of the conflict which had driven the emigrants across the ocean. In establishing a permanent settlement, the law and the form of government which was to govern them became a matter for them to determine themselves, under the limitations of the Royal charter. The difficulty of communication and the immense distance separating them from direct control enabled them to create a form of independent self-government. In order to rule with absolute authority, considered by them necessary, they established a theocracy—a union of State and Church constituting a dominating class.

The strong men of the colony formed themselves into a group. They were the rulers and the high priests. The translation of the Bible into English, under James I, was the source of their law. The law was their own interpretation of the Bible.

"The great middle class of British subjects had absorbed the doctrine of the Reformation. . . . With the introduction of the Bible, the

homes of the English people became a school of religious and theological discussion. . . . The children were baptized into Hebrew names. Large portions of the Bible were committed to memory. . . . Accepted as a great text book of literature, often the only book in the family, democracy was now esteemed a Divine Right of the Commons as monarchy had been and was then regarded by the aristocracy as the Divine Right of the King." Thomas W. Bicknell, *Story of John Clarke.*

All who would not willingly submit to the theocracy or oligarchy must be excluded from the colony. Religious intolerance was the instrument to accomplish exclusion. The policy of exclusion meant refusal to permit the other members of the community, not absolutely in accord with them or subservient to their domination, from sharing the power of control and the monopoly of financial and property interests in the colony.

This is an instance of the manner in which human nature acts under the same conditions. The Massachusetts Bay theocracy adopted the

same policy of exclusion to be found wherever, in Europe, Church and State were merged in the hands of the ruling dynasties.

In our time and in our country, the raising of the issue of intolerance, as against religious toleration and political equality, has no other motive than exclusion in order to establish or maintain political control. Intolerance may temporarily emerge from its hidden sources, but cannot withstand the light of the history of our free and constitutional government.

C. F. Adams in Massachusetts Historians says: "A modified form of toleration was grudgingly admitted into the first constitution of the state in 1789; it was not until 1833 that complete liberty of conscience was made part of the fundamental law."

C. F. Adams also cites Thomas Shepard, of whom Cotton Mather said, "His daily conversation was a trembling walk with God," in his *New England Lamentations For Old England's Errors:* "To cut off the hand of the magistrate from touching men for their con-

sciences will certainly in time (if it get ground) be the utter overthrow, as it is undermining, of the Reformation began. This opinion is but one of the fortresses and strongholds of Sathan, to keep his head from crushing by Christ's heels, who (forsooth) because he is krept into men's consciences, and because conscience is a tender thing, no man must here meddle with him, as if consciences were made to be the safeguard of sin and error, and Sathan himself, if once they can creep into them."

TERRORISM AND THE WITCHCRAFT MANIA

Jonathan Edwards, the most celebrated and eloquent of Puritan preachers, terrified his congregations by the violence of his denunciations of the wicked: "They will never be able to find anything to relieve them in hell. They will never find any resting place there; any place of respite, any secret corner which will be cooler than the rest, where they may have a little respite, a small abatement of the

extremity of their torment. They never will be able to find any cooling stream or fountain in any part of that world of torment; no, nor so much as a drop of water to cool their tongues. . . They will find no place where they can remain and rest and take breath for one minute; for they will be tormented with fire and brimstone and will have no rest day nor night forever and ever.

"Do but consider how dreadful despair will be in such torment. How dismal it will be, when you are under those racking torments, to know assuredly that you never, never shall have hope of ever being delivered, when you shall wish that you might be turned into nothing, but shall have no hope of it; when you shall wish that you might be turned into a toad or a serpent, but shall have no hope of it; when you would rejoice if you might but have any relief, after you shall have endured these torments millions of ages, but shall have no hope of it; when after you shall have worn out the age of the sun, moon and stars, in your dolorous groans and lamentations, without any rest

day or night, or one minute's ease, yet you shall have no hope of ever being delivered, when after you shall have worn out a thousand more such ages, yet you shall have no hope, but shall know that you are not one whit nearer to the end of your torments; but that still there are the same groans, the same shrieks, the same doleful cries, incessantly to be made by you, and that the smoke of your torment shall still ascend up forever and ever; and that your souls, which shall have been agitated with the wrath of God all this while, yet will still exist to bear more wrath; your bodies, which shall have been burning and roasting all this while in these glowing flames, yet shall have not have been consumed, but will remain to roast through an eternity yet, which will not have been at all shortened by what shall have been past.

". . . When the saints in heaven shall look upon the damned in hell it will serve to give them a greater sense of their own happiness, seeing how vastly different their case is from their own. The view of the doleful condition

of the damned will make them more prize their own blessedness. . . . The sight of hell torments will exalt the happiness of the saints forever. It will not only make them more sensible of the greatness and freeness of the grace of God in their happiness, but it will really make their happiness the greater, as it will make them more sensible of their own happiness; it will give them a more lively relish of it; It will make them prize it more. . . . A sense of the opposite misery, in all cases, greatly increase the relish of any joy or pleasure."

When Whitfield preached in this manner to 2,000 people on Boston Common in 1740 Charles Chauncey, quoted by C. F. Adams, speaks of "bitter shriekings and screamings, tremblings and agitation."

Similar insane delusions exist now and make their appearance occasionally, though they do not demand the sacrifice of human life. Their promoters commercialize the contagion of insanity which transforms individuals of average intelligence into mobs of unreasoning savages.

The reproach levelled at the witch-burners, while justified, does not usually take into consideration that the witchcraft mania prevailed to an even greater extent in Europe. The highest court of Normandy, during the reign of Louis XIV, in defining witchcraft as the infliction of disease or the destruction of property by unknown and mysterious means, describes it as the greatest of all crimes, having no more doubt of its reality than of burglary or highway robbery.

The King had pardoned and saved from the flames some poor women, when the provincial parliament sent a petition containing a remonstrance: "Your parliament have thought it their duty on occasion of these crimes, the greatest which men can commit, to make you acquainted with the general and uniform feeling of the people of this province with regard to them; it being moreover a question in which are concerned the glory of God and the relief of your suffering subjects, who groan under their fears from the threats and menaces of this sort of persons. . . . We humbly suppli-

cate your Majesty to reflect once more upon the extraordinary results which proceed from the malevolence of these people; on the loss of goods and chattels, and the deaths from unknown diseases, which are often the consequence of their menaces; . . . all of which may easily be proved to your Majesty's satisfaction by the records of various trials before your parliaments."

John Fiske says that in 1515 not less than 500 witches were executed in Geneva; that in Scotland, from 1560 to 1600, the average annual number of victims was 200. In 1597 James VI, published at Edinburgh his treaties on "Dæmonologie," in which he maintained that against so foul a crime as witchcraft any sort of evidence was good enough, and the testimony of very young children ought on no account to be omitted. In 1604, Parliament passed the famous "Witch Act," which remained on the statute-book until the reign of George II.

It was in the reign of Charles I that trials and executions under the Witch Act were

most frequent. During the Long Parliament the mania continued. Under the rule of Cromwell there was a sudden halt, and the delusion never fully recovered its hold upon the community.

This was the age of Newton and Locke. The last executions for witchcraft occurred in England in 1712 and in Scotland in 1722. In Germany, the case of Maria Renata, a nun beheaded for witchcraft, occurred as late as 1749, the year in which Goethe was born.

Fiske calls attention to the fact that the exodus of Puritans to New England occurred during the reign of Charles I, while the prosecutions for witchcraft were increasing toward a maximum in the mother country. It was also believed that Pagan countries were ruled by Satan, and that in the American wilderness the red men were devil's imps. Bearing all this in mind no one need be too severe nor indeed as critical as are some descendants of the Massachusetts Puritans.

C. F. Adams says of himself: "I claim descent from both Thomas Shepard and John

Cotton. My father was among the offspring of the former, my mother among those of the latter." This did not prevent Adams, in referring to the above quotation, from saying: "But it is useless to multiply citations where all are to the same effect. If in the somewhat arid as well as meager record of Massachusetts seventeenth century utterances there are any which, subsequent to 1637, favor religious toleration, or breathe the spirit of toleration, I am not familiar with them and would much like to have my attention called to them."

More than that, Adams expresses his full agreement with the following quotation, of which he says, "It is difficult to find any flaw in the following indictment by George Bishop in his *New England Judged:*"

"For this let me say, That tho' more Blood hath been shed, and with greater Executions, and in some sense more cruel, by those who have not pretended to religion, at least to *Liberty of Conscience,* from whom no other thing could be expected . . . yet from

Men pretending to Religion and Conscience, who suffered for Religion and their Conscience; who left their Native Country, Friends and Relatives, to dwell in a Wilderness for to enjoy their Conscience and Religion, from Professors who have made so much ado about Religion, and for their Conscience and set themselves up as the Height of all Profession of Religion and the most Zealous Asserters of Liberty of Conscience; and for that cause have expected to be had in regard, viz.: because of Conscience and Religion, for men . . . thus to Exceed all Bounds and Limits of Moderation, Law, Humanity and Justice, upon a People barely for their Conscience, and the Exercise of their Religion . . . and for you to do it, who yourselves are the Men (not another Generation) which so fled, which so suffered, is beyond a Parallel.

"But that which most of all may be the Astonishment and Detestation of Mankind is That (The Spirit of Persecution, Cruelty and Malice) should predominate in those, who had

loudly cried out of the Tyranny and Oppression of the Bishops in Old England, and from whom they fled; but when they settled in a place, where they had liberty to govern, made their little finger of Cruelty bigger than ever they found the Loyns of the Bishops."

Speaking of the early record of Massachusetts, Adams says: "It is not merely all one way, but, unhappily, in addition to breeding a strong spirit of intolerance, there runs through it a vein of sophistical excuse or implied denial which shows that the fathers of Massachusetts in saying and doing what they did say and do failed to act wholly according to their lights. In other words, they knew better. They had once been subjected to persecution. They were themselves the victims of religious intolerance, and as is usual with them, so situated they had in that school made rapid advance in the lessons in toleration. Now they were in power and authority, and being so, they proved themselves no less intolerant than those from whose intolerance they had fled.

From Morley we have a modern conception: "Toleration has become a standard commonplace, springing often from indifference, sometimes from skepticism, but rooted among men of understanding in the perception that the security for a living conscience is freedom and not authority."

What Morley says has become a "standard commonplace" has passed through fire and sword to reach that definition in our day. The struggle still continues. In our own country the voice of intolerance is heard, though with ever diminishing effect.

On one of the gates of the Chicago Columbian Exposition in 1892, commemorating the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, there was an inscription prepared by President Eliot of Harvard:

"Toleration in religion; the best fruit of the last four centuries."

In diametrical contrast to that inscription is cited by C. F. Adams the statement of Uriah Oakes, President of Harvard College from 1675 to 1681:

"I profess I am heartily for all due moderation. Nevertheless, I must add that I look upon an unbounded toleration as the first born of all abominations."

Increase Mather, who was President of Harvard from 1685 to 1701, announced his opinion of religious liberty in the following manner: "Moreover, sinful toleration is an evil of exceeding dangerous consequence; men of corrupt minds, though they may plead for tolerance and cry out for liberty of conscience, etc., yet if once they should become numerous and get power into their hands, none would persecute more than they." (Mather discloses by the words "get power" the real animus and purpose of intolerance. The theocracy he represented, whether consciously or not on his part, and of men like him, was to monopolize power in the community and state, and all the political and financial advantage of power, to the exclusion of all who were not given the right to share with them in the government of the state.) "I do believe that Anti-Christ has not a more probable

way to advance his kingdom of darkness than by a toleration of religions and persuasions."

To this we have the following contrast—not only the words we have quoted of a President of Harvard of our time, but the statement of a United States Senator of to-day, Senator Reed of Missouri, in the course of a debate, January 14th, 1927:

"The spirit of real religion is that of tolerance. Bigotry has no place beneath the spire of a Protestant tabernacle, under the cross of a Catholic church, or within the walls of a Jewish synagogue. . . . If this country is to live, then these fountain springs bearing the pure waters of liberty must not be polluted with the poison of hate, covered with the slime of proscription or polluted by the spirit of intolerance."

George Bishop, the Quaker writer, in 1703, quoted by C. F. Adams, said: "Shuffling and endeavoring to evade the guilt of it, being ashamed to own it, they seldom mention to any purpose, even in their histories."

Adams also says: "There was no form of

sophistry to which the founders of Massachusetts did not have recourse then . . . and there is almost no form of sophistry to which the historians of Massachusetts have not had recourse since;" and then goes on to say: "In the study of history there should be but one law for all. Patriotism, piety and filial duty have nothing to do with it. . . . The rules and canons of criticism applied in one case and to one character must be sternly and scrupulously applied in all similar cases and to all other characters; and while surrounding circumstances should and must be taken into careful consideration, they must be taken into equal consideration no matter who is concerned."

No one is more entitled to speak for Massachusetts than a member of the historic family of the Adamses. Their diaries and their histories are of immense value to us all. The writer takes pride in the fact that under Professor Henry Adams of Harvard he took honors in history, a subject ever since of interest to him.

The independence of thought which Henry Adams's generation has shown is evidenced by the fact that his brother, John Quincy, was the Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts, and candidate for Vice President, nominated with that great lawyer, Charles O'Connor of New York, a Catholic, for President, by the Louisville Democratic convention in 1872, for whom the writer cast his first vote. The Louisville Convention, assembled as a protest against the nomination by the Democratic Convention, at Baltimore, of Horace Greeley as a Democratic candidate for President. C. F. Adams, quoted here, is the grandson of John Quincy Adams, and the great grandson of John Adams.

C. F. Adams certainly lived up to his conception of what should be considered the best method of writing history, nor could he be accused of ancestor worship.

Bryce in a presidential address at the International Congress of Historical Studies, 1913, said: "One duty that was always incumbent on the historian has now become a

duty of deeper significance and stronger obligation. Truth, and truth only, is our aim. We are bound as historians to examine and record facts without favor or affection to our own nation or to any other."

To write history under the influence of local or patriotic feeling is nevertheless a pardonable fault. It may, however, and generally does, reach such proportions as to obscure the truth and even to completely distort it. Fortunately we are living in a much more critical age and our universities are producing historians whose chief aim is to be accurate.

The truth of the history of religious toleration on our side of the Atlantic does not require of us to be unpatriotic. The more we broaden our view, enabling us to establish the proper porportions among the different Colonial settlements in their relation to religious toleration, the more we shall as Americans have reason to take pride in the result as a whole. We should be able to realize that the indictment often brought against the intoler-

ance of the Massachusetts theocracy fails to consider that toleration meant to many of them the lack of all religion.

The intolerance was defended by Samuel Willard, who said: "I perceive they are mistaken in the design of our first planters whose business was not toleration but were professed enemies of it. . . . Their business was to settle, and, as much as in them lay, to secure religion to posterity."

Willard undoubtedly meant that a permanent Colonial settlement was the first consideration. We know of the many failures there were in the attempts at settlements which had to be abandoned. The successful settlement brought about concentration of temporal and religious power in the governing body composed of the strong men of the colony. The great achievement of the Massachusetts Colony should never be belittled. That they did so much as founders does not, however, mean that they did all. It is natural that their descendants should endeavor to maintain the fullest value to the nation of their heritage.

They, as John T. Morse, the editor of The Statesmen's Series, says so aptly of the Federalists, "have taken good care of the reading public."

RHODE ISLAND

PART IV

RHODE ISLAND

THE principles upon which the people of the United States have established and maintained their government are to be found in the early conditions of Rhode Island.

The small Rhode Island commonwealth under the leadership of Roger Williams had founded its improvised system of government upon a firm and lasting basis, eventually demonstrating that civil liberty and religious tolerance were to become the distinguishing and dominating features which have been and remain the glory of a great nation.

While the bitterness and severities accompanying religious dissensions in Europe were reflected in Massachusetts they were not to be found in Rhode Island. The recognition of this fact is not a criticism of the Massachusetts

Colony, but it is simple justice to Rhode Island, where there were no banishments and no penalty of death should the banished return.

Conceding what we owe to the Massachusetts Colony, we must equally recognize the debt of the Nation to the other Colonial settlements along the Atlantic coast from the British isles and continental Europe. It is not so much who was first, and that is open to discussion, as to realize the true origin of religious freedom and liberal institutions transferred from all of Europe to our continent.

A careful reading of such proclamations of intolerance may lead us to believe that it was an apparent conviction that toleration meant absence of religion. Whether this was or was not a sincere belief is open to discussion.

In the beginning of the fourth century the Emperor Galerius issued an edict in regard to the Christians: "We permit them therefore to express their private opinions and to assemble in their conventicles without fear of molestation, provided always that they preserve a due respect to the established law and

the government." The pagan toleration of Greece and Rome was followed under the Christian era by the long drawn out struggle, fulfilling the announcement, "I came not to send peace but a sword."

Everywhere in European and American civilization the characteristics of the conflict were the same. In Spain, Germany, Italy, France, Holland until we reach the Atlantic fringe of settlements of the colonizing powers, we find under different conditions the same conflict being waged—intolerance and religious toleration the opposing forces.

The history of the Massachusetts Colony, as distinguished from that of Rhode Island, is one of constant controversy upon the subject. We should not allow ourselves to belittle in any manner or to lack in appreciation of the great measure of gratitude owing to its leaders and founders.

Groupings may be formed seeking to employ religion as the basis of their own political power and ascendancy in the community. When the Bay State theocracy became re-

sponsible for acts of cruelty and persecution it sowed the seeds of revolt. The most permanent result of that revolt found expression in the founding of Rhode Island. Massachusetts had created an absolute theocracy; Rhode Island was constituted a democracy freed from theocratic control.

The Royal Charter of Rhode Island, of 1663, was the confirmation of the Declaration of Breda, issued April 4, 1660:

"We do declare a liberty to tender conscience, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the Kingdom, and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of Parliament as upon mature deliberation shall be offered to us for the full granting of that indulgence, Charles II, Rex."

The Crown did not encourage the establishment of a theocracy. The new charter obtained by Roger Williams and John Clarke, in 1663, declared:

"Our royal will and pleasure is that no per-

son within the said colonies at any time hereafter shall be anywise molested, punished, disquieted or called in question for any difference of opinion in matters of religion, and does not disturb the civic peace of our said colony . . . any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained, usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding."

Roger Williams's letter to Mason, *Narragansett Club Publications:* "This, his Majesty's grant, was startled at by his Majesty's high officers of state, who were to view it in course before the sending, but feared the (word missing) they crouched against their wills in obedience to his Majesty's pleasure."

These charters had been preceded by the banishment from the Massachusetts Bay Colony of Roger Williams, in 1636. With a few companions he established a plantation, including it in his territorial purchases from the Narragansetts, calling it Providence Plantations.

In 1638, William Coddington and others

were banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony and settled at Portsmouth. Coddington, with John Clarke and others, established a settlement on the south end of Aquidneck, calling it Newport. The territorial possessions acquired from the Narragansetts, they named Rhode Island. In 1663, Samuel Gorton and ten others, banished from Plymouth Colony, purchased Shawomet, or Warwick, of the Narragansetts, and founded the fourth community.

In 1644, Roger Williams returned from a visit to England with the first charter, constituting "The incorporation of Providence Plantations in Narragansett Bay." It conferred the right of civil government on the United Colony of the four towns. At a general assembly held in Newport, in 1647, a colonial government was organized, and John Coggeshall, of Newport, was chosen President of the colony. The charter of 1644 did not contain any reference to religion. William Coddington, of Newport, was made President of the four united towns, in 1649.

On the execution of Charles I and the accession of Cromwell under the Puritan Commonwealth, Coddington went to England secretly, and, during the confusion of the new government, obtained a commission as Governor for life of the islands of Aquidneck and Conanicut. This act, nullifying the charter, roused the whole colony. Roger Williams, representing the town of Warwick and Providence Plantations, and John Clarke were sent to England, in 1651, to secure the recall of Coddington's powers and the restoration of the charter.

Roger Williams returned in 1654, after a successful mission, owing largely to the influence of his friends, John Milton, and of Sir Harry Vane, both advocates of religious freedom, John Clarke remained in England to protect the interest of the colony. On the death of Cromwell, and the restoration of Charles II, in 1660, it became necessary to seek a new charter, which was obtained in 1663.

J. T. Adams in *Founding of New England,*

says: "At the opening of the inter-racial conflict the settlers probably numbered about 52,000 approximately, 37,000 in the seaboard colonies from Maine to Plymouth, 3,000 in Rhode Island and 12,000 in Connecticut. The number of Indians can be estimated with even less certainty. It is probable that the colonists outnumbered them by at least four to one. Almost any trouble with the natives became a sufficient excuse for an extorted cession of territory. The early settlers had recognized an Indian title to the country as distinct from the rights conveyed by the King in his Charter.

"The Indian theory of ownership was entirely different from that of the Europeans. The parchments which the savage signed with his mark inevitably became invalid. The natives never understood the nature of the transactions. They could not foresee, knowing nothing of Europe, that the few settlers were the vanguard of a steady and irresistible stream of immigration, or that the results of their having welcomed the first arrivals would

eventually be their own annihilation, or completely altered status. The first fear of the savages and the desire to convert them gave place to dislike, contempt, indifference, and the dealings with them sank to a lower plane. The temptation became irresistible to pick a quarrel with the natives, to interfere with their internal affairs and to conduct some military expedition when the result would be the acquisition of some desirable territory.

"As the whites encroached more and more upon the Indians their lands began to be looked upon as reservations upon which the native owners were permitted to remain until the growing needs of the settlers brought about a further advance. Nor were the Puritans who were by nature harsh and overbearing and who failed to display even the ordinary good manners of the time in their dealing with the Dutch, likely to exhibit any great amount of tact or courtesy in those which they had with the despised heathen and 'children of the devil.'

"Personal pride and a strict observance of

etiquette were marked characteristics of the savages. Chiefs and Sachems could not fail to be stung to the quick when they were summoned with more and more frequency and less courtesy to travel long distances and answer complaints before the courts of Plymouth or Massachusetts with little regard for their dignity or standing among their own people. In 1671, as a sequence to a rumored rising of the Indians in the Plymouth Colony, the squaw Sachem, Awashunks, was summoned to appear, and having done so voluntarily, she was required to submit the 'disposall of her lands to the authoritie' of the Colony, and to engage herself to pay 50 pounds to recompense the colonists for their trouble in the matter. As it was impossible that she could pay any such sum, the eventual disposal of her lands would not be difficult to foresee." Plymouth Records.

Roger Williams declared that land was becoming "one of the gods of New England." Any native, for example, heathen or Christian, who profaned the Sabbath day by hunting,

fishing, carrying firewood or other misdemeanors, was to be fined or whipped, while all were ordered "To hear the Word of God preached by Mr. Fitch or any other minister sent among them," subject to four shillings fine or corporate punishment. Connecticut Records.

J. T. Adams says, "A most unjust law in view of the well-understood inability of the Indians to withstand the temptation of strong drink, and the willingness of the colonists, in spite of legal prohibition, to sell it to them, was that which provided that any native found drunk should be compelled to labor for twelve days for whoever accused him and proved the charge, one-half of the proceeds of his labor to go to the accuser and one-half to the county treasury."

The Charter recognized the absolute right of the Indian tribes to the soil and the guarantee of the Indian titles to estates. This annulled all prior claims to Indian lands by right of discovery or conquest by the Crown, and made valid and binding all contracts between the Indians and the settlers.

The language of the Charter with reference to Indian lands included "such lands, islands, rivers, harbors and roads."

Differing from the method in other Colonies, the King confirmed the Indian sales instead of the Indians confirming grants bestowed by the Crown.

A second grant permitted the settlers "to direct, rule, order and dispose of all others and things, and particularly that which relates to the making of purchases of the native Indians."

These concessions sustained the claims of Williams and Clarke that the Indians were the rightful owners.

The charter was the guarantee of political life. It contained all the machinery of government responsible for its acts, with a General Assembly elected by the people, and provided with the means for self-protection and defense. This system has continued for three centuries. Suffrage was limited only by the will of the people; there were no property qualifications and no discrimination against

foreign born; all were recognized as freemen. It provided for majority rule in elections, which established the town as the unit of political institutions, which has been called "The purest illustration of popular government, of, for and by the people." Thomas W. Bicknell, *Story of John Clarke.*

ROGER WILLIAMS

Roger Williams arrived in Boston in 1631. Shortly after he was invited by the church to become a teacher in Salem. He had been chosen to the same position by the Boston Congregation, but refused because they would not acknowledge that they had separated from the Church of England. (Letter to John Cotton, Jr., 1671, *Narragansett Club Publication.)* He had announced his doctrine that the power of the magistrates should be limited to civil matters and that they had no authority to punish the breach of the Sabbath or other religious infractions. For these reasons the General Court found fault with the Salem church for accepting Williams.

He then added what was considered a dangerous doctrine in a declaration that the Indians, being the owners of the soil, the King had no right to grant charters dispossessing them. Williams' attitude coincided with that of the Dutch colonists, who obtained their lands by purchase, upon the theory that the land belonged to the Indians. Williams's denial of the legal basis of the colony, as much as his theory of religious toleration, caused his banishment. It was without doubt the latter, however, which brought down upon him special hostility. Winthrop, who notwithstanding his affectionate regard for Williams, declared that, specifically stated, that the ministers rendered their judgment "he who should obstinately maintain such opinions, whereby a church might fall into heresy, apostasy or tyranny, and yet the civil magistrates could not intermeddle should be removed."

The principles announced by Roger Williams, today universally accepted in Europe and America, brought about his banishment

from the Massachusetts colony. The Dutch Republic, where Williams had lived, maintained the principles announced by him in Massachusetts which he carried out after his banishment to Rhode Island. After the ministers of the Massachusetts colony had rendered judgment, the civil power was brought into play. Williams was cited to appear and the town of Salem was denied title to certain lands which it claimed as its own, until it should discard its clergyman or teacher. Williams then endeavored unsuccessfully to have the Salem church separated from the others, but he was ordered to be banished. (Massachusetts Record.) The decree of banishment was to take effect in the spring, provided Williams would refrain from preaching his doctrines. The theocracy having heard that he was planning to lead a colony to the Narragansett Indian lands and fearing that the infection would spread from there throughout the churches, decided to send him back to England, but he escaped and made his way to Rhode Island.

He and his companions held to their convictions, that free institutions demanded the separation of state from church. They succeeded in establishing the principle of toleration and in freeing themselves from the yoke of the theological repression and intolerance of the Massachusetts colony.

Bancroft says of Roger Williams[1]: "He was a Puritan and a fugitive from English persecution; but his wrongs had not clouded his accurate understanding; in the capacious recesses of his mind he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and he, and he alone, had arrived at the great principle which is its sole eventual remedy. He announced his dis-

[1] Williams's works, republished by Narragansett Club, 6 volumes, 1866:

Key to the Indian Languages of America, edited by Dr. Trumbull.

Williams's Views on Religious Liberty in His Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, London, 1664.

J. Cotton replied, The Bloudy Tenent Washed and Made White in the Bloud of the Lamb, London, 1647.

Williams's Rejoiner, The Bloudy Tenent Made Yet More Bloudy Through Mr. Cotton's Attempt to Wash It White, 1652.

George Fox Digged Out of His Burrowes, Boston, 1676.

Hireling Ministry None of Christ, London, 1652.

covery under the simple proposition of the sanctity of conscience. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; he should punish guilt, but never violate the freedom of the soul. He was the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of the liberty of the conscience, the equality of opinions before the law, and in its defense he was the harbinger of Milton, the 'precursor and the superior of Jeremy Taylor."

Roger Williams, according to Gervinus (1853) cited by Straus, *Roger Williams* founded a society "based on entire liberty of conscience and the uncontrolled power of the majority in secular affairs. The theories of Europe were here brought into practice. It was freely prophesied that these democratic movements would soon end themselves, but the institutions have not only maintained themselves but have spread over the whole union. They have given laws to one-fourth of the globe, and they stand in the background of every democratic struggle in Europe."

Dr. Borgeaud, of the faculty of law in Geneva, *Modern Democracy,* says of Roger Williams: "He was a theologian who had been brought up by a lawyer. The law student under Sir Edward Coke, an Anglican lawyer, accepted the contentions of Brown, the Separatist theologian. Williams on arriving in America was prepared to advance these views further. He brought about the complete separation of religious and civil authority, founding an absolute democracy. The community established in Rhode Island 'became the kernel of a state.' It accepted the charter granted by parliamentary England."

Borgeaud, citing from the records of acceptance, says: "These texts bear date 1647. If we compare them with what was taking place in Europe during this memorable year we shall be ready to allow that this is the first great date in the history of modern democracy." *Modern Democracy.*

Williams while in London procuring the charter was associated with Milton, Vane, and especially with the great revolutionist Crom-

well. We must guard ourselves from assuming that Rhode Island was the sole source of democracy in New England. Connecticut and Massachusetts contributed their share, although, especially in the case of Massachusetts, much later than Rhode Island.

Borgeaud says: "If we trace the origin of American democracy among the charters and constitutions of the New England states we find a startling proof of the close connection, which we must recognize, between the two great movements (Reformation and Democracy) of modern thought."

At a recent celebration at Geneva in memory of Calvin Borgeaud said: "We have above all to call up the vision of an American idea . . . that part which is not sufficiently known in the Old World. The man to whom it is due is Roger Williams."

Williams defined individual liberty in its relation to the governing power of the state: "There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common and is a true picture of a com-

monwealth, or a human combination or society. Both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks may be embarked in one ship. . . . I never denied that, notwithstanding their liberty of conscience, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course, and also to command that justice, peace and sobriety be kept and practiced both among the seamen and all the passengers. . . . If any shall mutiny rise up against their commander and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders because all are equal in Christ, I never denied, but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge and resist, compel and punish such transgressors."

John Locke (1632-1704) *Letters on Toleration,* restricts and defines "The Jurisdiction of the Magistrate, excluding it from the regulation of public worship or the control of religious beliefs, except so far as such worship or beliefs may interfere with the ends of civil government."

"The provinces of a Church and a Common-

wealth are distinct and separate and easily well-defined. The bounds are absolute."

"As to speculative opinions, tenets and practices of any religious community, the civil magistrate has no right of restraint."

"No opinions contrary to human society, or to those moral rules which are necessary to human society, are to be tolerated by the magistrate."

"Religious orthodox persons, who claim for themselves any peculiar privilege or power above others in civil concernments, or who, upon any pretense of religion or morality, challenge any manner of authority over others not of their faith, have no right to be tolerated by the magistrate as those that will not own and teach the duty of tolerating all men in matters of mere religion."

"Those are not to be tolerated who deny the being of God. Promises, covenants and oaths which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold on an atheist. The taking away of God, though but even in thought, dissolves all."

In Europe and in America, Catholics and Protestants denounced each other as "heretics," "devils," "the spawn of devils," it therefore does not surprise us that the same terms were applied to the Indians, regarded as heathens to be exterminated. The broad-minded and generous attitude of Williams, so far ahead of his time, so very different from that of his associates in the colonies is best illustrated by the following letters:

The year after Roger Williams came to Rhode Island he wrote to Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts: "I find what I could never hear before, that they have plenty of gods or divine powers: The Sun, Moon, Fire, Water, Snow, Earth, the Deer, the Bear. . . . I brought home lately from the Narragansetts the names of thirty-eight of their gods, all they could remember. They believe that the souls of great and good men and women go to the Southwest, to the house of Cautantowit. Murderers, thieves, and liars, their souls wander restless abroad. They thanked the gods for good hunting and fishing and harvest,

holding every year at harvest time a thanksgiving festival in honor of Cautantowit, who watched over the crops. They thought accidents and trouble were caused by his anger. They said, 'Fire must be a god, that out of a stone will arise in a spark and when a poor naked Indian is ready to starve with cold in the house, and especially in the woods, often saves his life, doth dress all our food for us, and if it is angry will burn the house about us.' " In this letter to Winthrop, who was his friend, there was nothing controversial; it unconsciously pictures Williams far in advance of his contemporaries and places him on a par with the broadest of modern churchmen.

It is equally remarkable that Williams's point of view in the seventeenth century is in accord with the position taken by the Presidents of the United States. President Washington, in a message to the Indian tribes, declared, "The general government will never consent to your being defrauded, but will protect you in all your just rights."

Jefferson, Monroe and William Henry

Harrison, when called upon to deal with the question, took a similar position.

"It may be regarded as certain that not a foot of land will ever be taken from the Indians without their own consent. The sacredness of their rights is felt by all thinking persons in America as much as in Europe." Jefferson to M. Meunier.

"I shall rejoice to see the day when the red men, our neighbors, become truly one people with us, enjoying all the rights and privileges we do, and living in peace and plenty as we do, without any one to make them afraid, to injure their persons, or to take away their property without being punished for it according to fixed law." Jefferson to the Cherokee Chief (1808).

President Grant, as an officer of the United States Army, who had known the Indian while waging war against him, in his second inaugural address, in 1873, said: "Our superiority of strength and advantage of civilization should make us lenient toward the Indian. The wrong inflicted upon him should be taken into

account and the balance placed to his credit. The moral view of the question should be considered, and the question asked, 'Cannot the Indian be made a useful and productive member of society by proper teaching and treatment?' If the effort is made in good faith we will stand the better before the civilized nations of the earth, and in our own consciences for having made it."

Roger Williams also wrote to Winthrop: "Canonicus, the old high Sachem of the Narragansett Bay, (a wise and peaceable Prince), once in a solemn oration to myself, in a solemn assembling, said, 'I have never suffered any wrong to be offered to the English since they landed, nor never will. If the Englishman speak true, if he mean truly, then shall I go to my grave in peace, and hope that the English and my posterity shall live in love and peace together.'" *Our State, Rhode Island,* Miner.

Not many to-day can equal Williams in his breadth of view in respect to the Indians on our continent. That was but typical of his

clear understanding, even at the time in which he lived of the fact, so few then recognized, that all mankind, of whatever race, possess some form of religion. Like Jefferson, Williams is of that small group of great men who are not to be confined to a period in the world's history. Their influence is permanent, their principles are immortal.

JEFFERSON

It was Jefferson who caused to be inscribed in his epitaph not that he had been twice President of the United States or had effected the Louisiana Purchase, adding almost a continent to the United States, but that he was the author of the Virginia statute of religious freedom, 1786:

"Our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions more than on our opinions on physics or geometry; that therefore the prescribing of any citizen as unworthy to public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument, unless he professes or renounces this or that religious opinion, is depriving him unjustly of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right."

It was Maryland that had preceded Virginia in the Toleration Act of 1649, and there is no

part of our country that has taken more pride in the establishment of religious freedom than have the Southern States.

In a letter to Albert Gallatin, June 16, 1817, Jefferson said: "Three of our papers have presented us the copy of an act of the Legislature of New York, which, if it really has passed will carry us back to the times of the darkest bigotry and barbarism to find a parallel. Its purport is that all who shall hereafter join in communion with the religious sect of Shaking Quakers shall be deemed civilly dead, their marriages dissolved, and all their children and property taken out of their hands. . . . It contrasts singularly with a contemporary vote of the Pennsylvania Legislature, who on a proposition to make belief in God a necessary qualification for office, rejected it by a great majority, although assuredly there was not a single atheist in their body. And you may remember to have heard that when the Act for Religious Freedom was before the Virginia Assembly, a motion to insert the name of Jesus Christ before the phrase,

'the author of our holy religion,' which stood in the bill, was rejected, although that was the creed of a great majority of them."

"One of the amendments to the Constitution . . . expressly declares that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press'; thereby guarding in the same sentence and under the same words, the freedom of religion, of speech and of the press; insomuch, that whatever violates either throws down the sanctuary which covers the others."—Kentucky Resolutions, Writings of Thomas Jefferson.

"How far does the duty of toleration extend? 1. No church is bound by the duty of toleration to retain within her bosom obstinate offenders against her laws. 2. We have no right to prejudice another in his *civil* employment because he *is* of another church. (The italics are Jefferson's)."—Notes on Religion, Writings of Thomas Jefferson.

"Its the refusing *toleration* (the italics are

Jefferson's) to those of a different opinion which has produced all the bustles and wars on account of religion."—Notes on Religion, Writings of Thomas Jefferson.

CONCLUSION

THE VINDICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

The leaders who preach religious intolerance, who do not regard the provision in the Constitution as binding, who by secret organizations are fanning the dying embers of religious dissensions, see the end of their political influence in the inauguration of a President whose election would be the vindication of a fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States that: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

The election of a Protestant, now the President of the French Republic, where the great majority of the people are Catholics, was not an event arising from religious controversy, but is the development, to its complete recognition, of religious tolerance and political equality.

The election in 1926,[1] for the fourth time consecutively, of a non-Protestant as governor of a great State brings the country, *without regard to party affiliations,* to the consideration, not of a religious issue, created by individuals, political parties or churches, but of the question solely of carrying to its complete acceptance political equality and religious toleration guaranteed by the Constitution, as applied, according to its letter, "to any office or public trust," including the Chief Magistracy.

In our time and in our country, a political appeal to intolerance can have no other motive than to secure or maintain political power.

[1] Telegram to Governor Smith on his re-election for the fourth time in 1926:

"One of the millions to congratulate you on the vindication of the provision in the Constitution that no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United State. This fundamental principle applies especially to the Presidency. The religious test established in England for political and dynastic reasons has no place on American soil.

PERRY BELMONT."

APPENDIX

The Invasion of America By Europe.

Spanish Colonies in North America: and Explorations

1493: On his second expedition Columbus founded the colony and town of Isabella, on the island of Haiti.

1511: Spain took possession of Cuba. San Juan, capital of Porto Rico, founded by Ponce de Leon.

1512: Ponce de Leon discovered Florida, and in 1521 failed in the attempt to establish a colony there.

1513: Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Panama and discovered the Pacific Ocean. He took possession of the Isthmus, its coasts and adjacent islands.

1519-21: Cortez conquered Mexico, establishing the Spanish Empire in America.

1525: Gomez explored the Atlantic Coast from Maine to the Carolinas.

1528: Narvaez made the second attempt to establish a Spanish colony in Florida.

1539: Coronado discovered the Grand Canon of the Colorado River.

1541: De Soto reached the Mississippi River.

1565: Menendez founded a colony at St. Augustine, Florida.

1569: Spanish colony established at Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1582: Spanish monks established missions in New Mexico and Arizona.

French Colonies and Explorations in North America

1524: Verrazano, sailing in the service of France, enabled Francis I to claim the territory from the Atlantic Coast northward from Cape Fear, which he called New France, but conditions in Europe prevented the founding of any colonies at that time.

1534: Cartier entered the Bay of St. Lawrence, 1535: Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence to the Lachine Rapids and Montreal. 1541 Cartier and Roberval attempted to establish a colony on the St. Lawrence River, but failed.

1562-65: Ribault and Laudonnière founded a Huguenot colony near the St. John River in Florida. 1565: That colony was destroyed by Menendez.

1603: French occupation of Canada commenced when Champlain sailed up the St. Lawrence River. 1605: Champlain founded Fort Royal (Annapolis, N. S.) and sailed along the coast as far as Cape Cod.

1608: Champlain created a colony at Quebec.

1609: Champlain discovered Lake Champlain, and established a colony, 1615. Champlain discovered Lake Huron, via the Ottawa Rapids.

1634: Nicollet discovered Lake Michigan, crossing Lake Huron and sailing through the Straits of Mackinaw.

1668: Père Marquette established a mission at Sault-Sainte-Marie, Michigan, the first permanent French colony established in the Northwest. 1673: Marquette explored the Mississippi from its upper sources for about a thousand miles.

1682: Lasalle explored the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico, claiming the territory irrigated by the Mississippi and its branches for France, calling this continental empire Louisiana, after Louis XIV.

1688: New Rochelle, near New York, was colonized by the Huguenots. The French government having allowed them to establish themselves in New France, many of them went to Virginia, the Carolinas and other American colonies.

1689: Frontenac was sent to America by Louis XIV as Governor of Canada.

1702: The French removed the capital of Louisiana to the Mobile River, near Mobile and established in that way the first settlement in what is now Alabama.

1758: The French won a victory over the English on Lake Champlain. The English took possession of

the Valley of the Ohio in that year. 1759: The English conquered the region surrounding Lake Champlain and took possession of Quebec. 1760: The English took Montreal and completed their conquest of Canada.

First English Explorations in North America

1576-78: Frobisher made three attempts to find a north-west passage to Asia. 1578 Drake explored the Pacific Coast as far as what is now the State of Washington, claiming the territory for England. 1583: Humphrey Gilbert landed at St. Jean (Newfoundland) and took possession, his expedition aided by Queen Elizabeth. 1584: Sir Walter Raleigh, half-brother of Humphrey Gilbert, equipped an expedition which landed in Pimlico Sound, and the region was named Virginia in honor of the Queen. 1585: Raleigh sent an expedition under orders of Sir Richard Grenville, who established a colony on Roanoke Island, off the Carolina coast. 1587: Raleigh equipped another expedition to Virginia.

1602: Gosnold, an English merchant, established a colony at Buzzard's Bay. In this year other expeditions followed, and definitely organized groups of colonies were founded. 1686: The Virgina Company was organized to establish trading colonies in America. James I granted the charter to London and Plymouth merchants. The company was divided into two groups, called the London Company and

the Plymouth Company. The former was granted all land between the 34th and 38th degree of latitude, and the Plymouth all between the 41st and 45th, the intervening land to go to the company that first made settlements in it. The company had rights of trade, but also of government and administration, as in fact other such companies that England organized in different parts of the world.

Virgina Dare was the first white child born in the British colonies in 1606.

Permanent colonies from the British Isle in North America

1607: Plymouth Company established a company, which failed, in what is now the State of Maine. The London Company founded the first permanent English colony in America at Jamestown, Virginia, in the name of King James. The Virginia colonies secured a share in their government by the establishment of the first representative assembly in America, called the "House of Burgesses."

1620: The Pilgrims landed at Cape Cod and founded the first settlement in New England at Plymouth.

Sir Fernandine Gorges and John Mason secured a concession from the Plymouth Company and established a colony at Saco, Maine. 1624: Virginia became a royal colony. 1628: The Massachusetts

Bay Colony was established at Salem by John Endicott.

1630: Boston was founded by the English Puritans. 1633: Connecticut was settled on the Connecticut River at Windsor by the Pilgrims. The Dutch had previously erected a trading post at Hartford.

1634: Lord Baltimore sent Leonard Calvert to establish the first permanent colony in Maryland. It was proposed to make Maryland a refuge for the Catholics who had been persecuted in England.

1636: Settlement of Rhode Island by Roger Williams. Williams believed in the separation of church and state.

Dutch Explorations and Colonies in North America

1609: Hendrick Hudson, in the service of the India Company, sailed up the Hudson River endeavoring to discover a passage to India. 1614: The Dutch established colonies on the Island of Manhattan and at Fort Orange (Albany). These possessions were called the New Netherlands. 1617: The first Dutch colonies were established in New Jersey at Bergen. 1623: New Amsterdam, New York, was founded by the Dutch. 1626: Peter Minuit, director-general of New Netherlands, purchased Manhattan Island from the Indians for $24. 1629: New Netherlands instituted the Patroon system. Any person under this system who should send

50 adults to New Netherlands could have land bordering either on the Hudson or on the Delaware, 16 miles on one bank, or 8 miles on both, extending into the interior. The Lord Patroon was given rights similar to those of a feudal lord; the right to make laws, to limit hunting and fishing rights, and requiring all corn to be ground at his mill. One of the most important of these families was the Van Rensselaer family, which demanded such rights as late as 1840.

1627: The Swedes settled in Delaware. (Croscup's *United States History.*)

German Immigration to North America

The people of Central Europe were not leaders in the great voyages of discovery and were at a disadvantage in comparison with the Spanish, English, French, Dutch, Portuguese and Scandinavians. There were advance movements of immigration under the flags of the seafaring nations into the early settlements, but the important accessions of German immigration did not appear until the 18th century. The first permanent settlement of Germans was made at Germantown, Pennsylvania, in the last quarter of the 17th century, in 1683. During the 18th century, the area which furnished the largest number of immigrants was the south-western part of Germany, the Palatinate, Württemberg, and Baden. Those from

the Palatinate surpassed the others to such an extent that German immigrants were called Palatines. The devastations caused by the Thirty Years' War, 1618-48, and the war of the Spanish Succession, had the effect of largely increasing the immigration. The immigration between 1790 and 1820 was slight, but continued, nevertheless, during the early part of the 19th century and increased from 1840 to 1860; it reached its highest point between 1846 and 1854, the revolution of 1848 having an important influence upon it, but it was not until after the Civil War that the great tide of German immigration set in.

Wars of Europe Extending to North America

The great wars of Europe during the 17th and 18th centuries eventually extended to America, there taking the form of the "Intercolonial Wars." The treaties of Ryswick, 1697, Utrecht, 1713, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748, and Paris, 1763, primarily concerned with the solution of essentially European questions, were equally decisive in their effect upon America.

The Treaty of Ryswick ended the first Intercolonial War, in America called King William's War (1689-1697), in Europe, the War of the League of Augsburg, the beginning of a struggle continuing until the destruction of French power in America.

REIGNING CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS DURING THE COLONIZATION PERIOD

Spain.	England.	France.	Austria.	Sweden.
			1493–1519, Maximilian I	
1516–1556, Charles V of Austria and Spain		1515–1547, Francis I	1519–1556, Charles V (I of Spain)	1523–1560, Gustavus I
1556–1598, Philip II	1558–1603, Elizabeth	1547–1559, Henry II	1556–1564, Ferdinand I	1560–1568, Eric XIV
1598–1621, Philip III	1603–1625, James I	1559–1560, Francis II	1564–1576, Maximilian II	1568–1592, John III
1621–1665, Philip IV	1625–1649, Charles I	1560–1574, Charles IX	1576–1612, Rodolph II	1592–1598, Sigismund III
1665–1700, Charles II	1653–1658, Cromwell	1574–1589, Henry III	1612–1619, Matthias	1604–1611, Charles IX
	1658–1660, Cromwell (Richard)	1589–1610, Henry IV	1619–1637, Ferdinand II	1611–1632, Gustavus II (Adolphus)
	1660–1685, Charles II	1610–1643, Louis XIII	1637–1658, Ferdinand III	1633–1654, Christina
	1685–1688, James II	1643–1715, Louis XIV		1654–1660, Charles X

The Treaty of Utrecht put an end to the second Intercolonial War between France and England, in America known as Queen Anne's War (1702-1714), in Europe, the War of the Spanish Succession, England securing possession of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Hudson Bay. Fishing rights on the Atlantic were reserved by France.

The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle closed the third Intercolonial War between France and England, in the English Colonies known as King George's War, in Europe, the War of the Austrian Succession (1744-1748). Though Louisburg—the chief French fortress of the North—had been taken during the war, it was restored to France by the treaty, owing to the exigencies of the European settlements.

The Treaty of Paris brought to an end the fourth and last Intercolonial War, known in America as the French and Indian War (1754-1763). In Europe, France, bound by her alliance with Austria, took part in the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) which caused the loss of her American colonies. In 1755, General Braddock led an army against the French in Ohio. He was defeated, but George Washington, then an officer in the British army, saved the remainder of Braddock's force. By the treaty of Paris, France, under the reign of Louis XV, yielded to England all her possessions in North America east of the Mississippi, with the exception of New Orleans. Spain ceded Florida to England in exchange for

Havana, conquered during that war, and France abandoned to Spain Louisiana, the vast territory west of the Mississippi extending to the Canadian border, and which comprised what are now the States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, and a large portion of Oklahoma.

CAMP HILL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

277.32 S
B417
Belmont, P.
Political equality
Urban

277.32 S
B417